NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment-----Without Compromise.

VOLUME IV.---NO. 39. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 195.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At 143, Nassau Street, New-York.

DAVID LEE CHILD, Editor.

☞ All remittances, and letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper, should be addressed to ISAAC T. HOPPER.

TERMS.—$2,00 a year, in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10,00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1,50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post Office Department: "A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

SPEECH

Of Mr. Winthrop, of Massachusetts, on the Right of Petition, delivered in the House of Representatives of the United States, January 23d and 24th, 1844.

Mr. Winthrop said that it seemed to have been the fortune of the House to be employed, during no inconsiderable part of the time since the present session commenced, in discussing what are called *first principles*. For eight or ten days, not long since gone by, we were occupied with the consideration of that great writ of personal liberty, the *habeas corpus*. And, in the course of that discussion, doctrines were advanced, in some quarters of the House, to his mind not a little strange and startling, and upon which he desired at the time, to have made some comments. But, in common with many other gentlemen better entitled to a hearing, he had attempted in vain to obtain the floor for that purpose. We had now been engaged, during the morning hour of many days, in a debate on a second great principle of civil liberty—*the right of petition*. And upon this subject opinions had been expressed, and positions maintained, which, in his judgment, were even more extraordinary, and more startling; and from which he was glad of an opportunity to declare his utter dissent.

The idea (said Mr. W.) that the right of petition does not imply the right of having a petition received! The doctrine that the right of the people to apply to the government for redress of grievances, does not involve any obligation on the part of the government to heed, or even hear, that application! The position which has been seriously maintained here, that all that was ever intended by the right of petition, was the right of individuals, or of assemblies, to prepare and sign a paper, setting forth the grievances under which they are suffering, and the redress which they seek; and that it was no part of that intention to secure to that paper any consideration or entertainment whatever from those to whom it is addressed! Why, sir, these doctrines seem to me about as reasonable as it would be to contend, that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* implies no obligation on the part of the officer to whom it is directed to regard or obey the writ, and no duty on the part of the government to execute or enforce; but is only designed to secure to an imprisoned citizen the satisfaction of having the writ itself, duly signed and attested, to amuse himself with in his solitary confinement; to meditate upon by day, or to put under his pillow to dream upon by night! They seem to me about as reasonable as it would be to maintain, that the freedom of the press extends only to the freedom of the mechanical enginery of the press; that it was only intended to secure the rights of individual printers to compose, set up, and strike off, such matter as might be agreeable to them; but that it does not reach to the privilege of publishing or circulating that matter after it is stricken off! In a word, Mr. Speaker, if the right of petition is really nothing more than it has been represented to be by some of the honorable members who have preceded me in this debate, it is, in my judgment, as poor a pretense, as miserable a mockery, as empty and unmeaning and worthless an abstraction, as was ever dignified by a swelling name, or a high-sounding title; and the sooner it is expunged from the roll of civil liberty, the sooner it ceases to hold out to the ear a promise only to be broken to the hope, the sooner will the people understand what rights they do possess.

But, sir, I desire to proceed with this subject a little more methodically, and to notice with something more of precision and exactness the arguments which have been adduced in favor of these doctrines.

The question before the House is, whether the rule, which has obtained a most odious notoriety, in many quarters of the country, under the name of the 21st rule, and which has lost nothing of its offensiveness by recently assuming the *alias* of the 23d rule, shall remain as one of the permanent rules and orders of the present Congress. This is the question plainly presented in the instructions which have been moved by the honorable member from Georgia, (Mr. Black,) and this is the question no less plainly involved in the simple motion to recommit the report. And what is this rule? It is a rule providing that no petitions, resolutions, memorials, or other papers, *on certain enumerated subjects*, shall be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever. Now, sir, I care not what those enumerated subjects are. I hold it entirely unimportant to this argument to state them. Whatever they may be, the principle of the rule is, in my judgment, the same. If this House may declare today that it will receive no petitions on one class of subjects, it may to-morrow declare that it will receive no petitions on another class of subjects; and, on the third day it may refuse to receive any petitions at all. The real inquiry is, have we a right to prescribe to those who have sent us here on what particular subjects their prayers shall be heard in these halls? Is it within our prerogative to say to the people of the United States: "Gentlemen, you may assemble together in what numbers you please, to consult upon what you may choose to consider your grievances; you may sign your petitions individually or collectively; you may adopt resolutions in your primary meetings or in your legislative assemblies; but if those petitions or resolutions contain any allusion to this, that, or the other topic, we will not receive them, or entertain them in any way whatever?"

Sir, I utterly deny the existence of any such right on our part. I hold it to be inconsistent with the relations we sustain to our constituents. I hold it to be unwarranted by anything, either in the reason or the history of parliamentary proceedings. I hold it to be in direct conflict with the spirit and intent of express provisions of the Constitution. And I hold it, also, to be subversive of original, inherent, and inalienable rights of the people.

The honorable member from Tennessee, (Mr. A. V. Brown,) in justifying this rule, a few mornings ago, drew an analogy from the relations of parent and child; and, in the application of this analogy, this House was made to play the part of the parent, and the people were left to sustain the character of the child! It was a good illustration, sir, of the sort of reasoning by which this rule must be defended, if it is defended at all. But this House does not stand *in loco parentis* to the people of the United States. We are not their parents, masters, or guardians. We are sent here to ascertain their wishes; to carry out their will; to do their work. And for us to undertake to limit their liberty to address us, or abridge their privilege of being heard here, on any subjects on which they may choose to be heard, is to reverse entirely our relative positions. It is the representative instructing the constituent; the agent prescribing terms to his principal; the servant imposing conditions on the master!

I shall be told that individual petitioners are not the people; and that the rights of the signers of petitions, few or many, are not to be confounded with the rights of the people at large. There would be some fitness and some force in this suggestion, if we were considering the reception of a single petition, or of any ascertained number of petitions. But where is the limit to this rule? Where is the limit to the principle of this rule? Why, sir, this rule excludes, practically and daily, thousands and hundreds of thousands of petitioners. It denies a hearing, practically and daily, to whole States—sovereign States—speaking through the resolutions of their legislatures. The journals, I think, will show that the resolutions of four or five States have been thrust back into the faces of their representatives on this floor, in a single hour of a single morning. And if as many States as were arrayed here the other day on the subject of General Jackson's fine, (seventeen, I think,) could come to a common opinion on any point connected with any one of the subjects enumerated in this rule—nay, if all the States in the Union, or all the people of all the States, could come, as they ought to come, and as I believe one day or other they will come, to the conclusion, that whatever may be done with the institution of slavery in the District of Columbia, the *slave trade* here shall be no more tolerated, but that this metropolis of the American republic shall be purged from the pollution of an inhuman and abominable traffic—this rule is broad enough, and general enough, to deny a hearing to them all! In principle, then, this rule goes the full length of asserting the right of this House, to say to the people, to the whole people of the Union, "Come one, come all, we will not hear you."

But, says the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Rhett,) have we not a plenary power, under the Constitution, "to determine our own rules of proceeding?" Yes, sir, we have that power, and there is no appeal from our determination as to those rules. But power is one thing, and *right* is another. We have the power to do many things in this House, which we have yet no manner of right to do. We are the final judges of the elections and returns of our own members. And if a majority in this House, in its willfulness or its wantonness, should see fit to give the seat in a contested election, to a candidate clearly in a minority, or to admit to a right of membership on this floor persons under twenty-five years of age, or who have resided less than seven years in the United States, or persons who do not possess any other of the constitutional or legal qualifications of members, (and something of this sort has been done, as I think, at this very session,) there is no power elsewhere to revise or reverse our decision. We have the power, also, to adopt a rule of proceeding by which the yeas and nays shall not be recorded on a call of one-fifth of the members present, or shall not be recorded at all; and, indeed, a majority of this House almost went this length at the outset of the session, in excluding from the records a full and intelligible statement of the question on which the yeas and nays were demanded. We have the power, too, to suppress or expunge from our journals any proceedings which we may not fancy to have the people find recorded there; and this proceeding, again, is not entirely unknown to this capitol, or even to this House during the present session. But who can assert that we have any *right* to resort to such measures, in defiance of express provisions of the Constitution? Sir, it is plain that this power to determine the rules of our own proceeding must be held in subordination to other provisions of the Constitution, and must be exercised also with a due regard to the rights, the reserved or inherent rights, of the people. Our power over our own rules of proceeding is, indeed, an irresponsible power. But this consideration should only make us the more anxious to ascertain what is its rightful and constitutional limit, and the more careful to keep ourselves strictly within that limit.

It is contended, however, by the advocates of this rule, that it is not inconsistent with any provision of the Constitution, nor with any right of the people. The 1st article of the amendments to the Constitution, it is said, provides only that "Congress shall make no *law* abridging the right of the people to petition the government for a redress of grievances;" and this rule is not a law. Sir, this is sticking to the bark of the Constitution with a witness to it! Can it be seriously pretended that it is consistent with the spirit and intent of this clause, that one branch of Congress should effect, by a mere rule of proceeding, what both branches are prohibited from effecting by solemn statute? If the Senate and the House of Representatives and the President combined, can pass no law abridging the right of the people to petition the government, is it not, *a fortiori*, incompetent for this House alone to abridge that right? But I deny the propriety of this literal interpretation of the word *law* in the article in question. The 1st article of amendment, as it originally passed the House of Representatives in 1789, did not contain that word. Its phraseology was—"*the right of the people to apply to the government for redress of grievances shall not be infringed.*" This is the real *gist* of the provision. The Senate, in incorporating some additional matter into the same article, found it necessary to change the construction of the sentence. But it was a change of construction only; and there is not the slightest ground for the idea that any change of the sense or substance was intended.

Why, sir, this article of amendment, with many others, was adopted, as is well known, on the recommendation of a number of the State conventions, by which the Constitution was originally ratified. And in what terms did those State conventions recommend it? In what terms did your own State of Virginia propose its adoption? "*Every freeman has a right to petition*, or apply to the legislature for the redress of grievances." This was the language of Virginia in 1789; and it was well said of it by Judge Tucker, in his appendix to Blackstone, that "it was the language of a free people asserting their rights," while the language of the Constitution, he adds, "savors of that style of condescension in which favors are supposed to be granted."

But we are told by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Rhett,) and again by the gentleman from Alabama, (Mr. Belser,) that this article was adopted in contemplation of a particular mode of abridging the right of petition; that it had reference to certain old English riot laws, which prohibited the people from assembling in tumultuous masses to petition the government. Admit all that the gentlemen have said on this point. Admit that the language of this article was derived from the English bill of rights, and was originally aimed at some particular restraint upon the right in question. What then? Is there anything in the article which confines its application, now and at all times to come, to the particular mode of abridgment which first gave occasion to it? Sir, the phraseology of the article is comprehensive and general. It declares that the right of petition shall not be abridged by Congress; not that it shall not be abridged in one way, or in another way, but that it shall not be abridged at all. Gentlemen might as well contend that the general statute of murder was only designed to prevent and punish those kinds of homicide which were in vogue when the statute was passed, as to contend that this article of the Constitution was only intended to prohibit those modes of abridging the right of petition which were contemplated at the time of its adoption. Upon this principle, if any ingenious villain could only discover some new mode of putting an end to human life, it would be "*killing—no murder!*" Such a principle would make a farce of all legislation.

But the honorable member from Alabama, (Mr. Belser,) has discovered sundry instances in which the British house of commons have refused to receive petitions, and have even passed rules for refusing to receive them. And upon this discovery he has founded what he seemed to consider a most triumphant argument in favor of the constitutionality of the rule of this House. The argument, if I understand it, is this: that the refusal to receive petitions at discretion, was a well-known practice of the British parliament before the adoption of our Constitution; that the framers of the Constitution must have understood and contemplated that practice; and that therefore, in default of any express allusion to it, there is no reason for imagining that it was intended to be reached or remedied by the article of amendment in question.

Now, sir, I disagree to this argument altogether, I deny the correctness both of the premises, and of the conclusion. I maintain, in precise opposition to it, that, in the first place, the right to present petitions to the government, including the right to have these petitions received, was an old, original, inherent right of the people of Great Britain, acknowledged and allowed from a time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. I maintain, in the second place, that the framers of our Constitution understood and appreciated this inherent right. I maintain, in the third place, that the refusal to receive petitions in certain cases, in the British house of commons, was an exception to the general principles and general practice of that body, arising out of circumstances peculiar to those cases, and furnished no justification for the rule which is under consideration here. And I maintain, in the fourth place, that there is abundant reason for the assurance, that the framers of the Constitution would have been the last persons in the world to sanction such refusals, or to consider them as in any degree furnishing precedents for us to follow. I am aware, sir, that it is not often easy to prove the affirmative of propositions of this kind. But if the House will bear with me a few moments, I think I can show them, at least, that I do not speak without book.

And here, Mr. Speaker, if I had a whole morning before me, instead of the rapidly flying remnant of a little hour, I might bring to the remembrance of gentlemen not a few passages of English history of a most interesting and instructive character. I might go back to those great conflicts for civil liberty in the old world, two centuries ago, by which our fathers were exercised and instructed for its establishment in the new. I might refer to days, on which thousands and tens of thousands of citizens were seen going up to parliament, *en masse*, to present their petitions for redress; days, when the constituents of the immortal John Hampden were seen riding from Buckinghamshire, each one with a copy of a famous protest, which they had adopted, in his hatband, to petition against ship money, and to demand the release from imprisonment of their gallant and glorious representative; days, when fifteen thousand women, headed by the wife of an honest brewer, were seen wending their way with a petition to the very doors of the house of commons; and those doors were thrown open to receive them! And what was the moral of those scenes? Sir, in those days the champions of the popular cause relied greatly on the exercise of this right of petition to strengthen them in their struggles against the encroachments and exactions of the crown. Petitions to the parliament and petitions to the king, were then among the most important instruments of the popular movement. There was even a time when the friends of freedom assumed the party name of *Petitioners*, and when the friends of prerogative and power were known by the name of *Abhorrers*—abhorrers of petitions! and these names of petitioners and abhorrers were as common and as general as whig and tory afterwards were, and designated respectively the same party divisions. And there is one little anecdote of those days, which I cannot forbear reciting with greater exactness. It is the anecdote of a man, whose real name is not recorded in the pages of history, but who gave a name to himself, which will not soon be forgotten—a man who seems to have forshadowed something of the indomitable spirit on the subject of the right of petition, which has been so often manifested on this floor by my honored and venerable colleague, (Mr. Adams,) a man who went in person into the very presence of King Charles I. and presented him a petition, complaining of some act of oppression, and demanding redress. "How dare you," said the king, "present me such a petition?" "May it please your majesty," said the man, "my name is DARE." He was rewarded for his boldness, not as my venerable colleague was, on a well-remembered occasion, by resolution of censure or impeachment, (*telum imbelle, sine ictu!*) but by a heavy fine, and a long continued imprisonment. If I remember right, sir, the first child born in the Jamestown colony, was christened "*Virginia Dare*," and perhaps the name was in honor of this stout and sturdy old upholder of the right of petition! This supposition, however, would involve a slight anachronism, I fear, and must therefore be abandoned. I fear still more that most of the *Dare* family of Virginia of the present day would be disposed to renounce and disown such a namesake.

But these historical reminiscences, pertinent as they are, do not come near enough to the point, to answer the purpose of my argument; and I proceed to cite a case, which will more clearly sustain the exact positions I have laid down.

In the year 1668, one Mr. Thomas Skinner presented a petition to the British house of lords, complaining of certain oppressive acts of the East India Company. These acts were properly cognizable, it would seem, by the ordinary courts of law. But the lords, notwithstanding, determined to assume jurisdiction, and decide upon them for themselves. The East India Company thereupon presented a petition to the house of commons, complaining of the house of lords, and denying their right to proceed in the premises. The lords immediately took umbrage at this petition, as libellous and scandalous—as a breach of their privilege, and an encroachment upon their prerogative, and proceeded to punish Sir Samuel Bernardiston, and other members of the company, by fine and imprisonment. A long and angry dispute forthwith arose between the two branches of parliament, on this particular point: how far petitions which were presented in the house of commons could be taken notice of in the house of lords, or elsewhere; and, in the course of this dispute, the right of petition generally underwent a strict and thorough investigation. Elaborate reports were made on both sides, and sundry resolutions were adopted. I find no detailed record of the reports, but among the resolutions adopted by the commons, were the following:

That it is an inherent right of every commoner of England, to prepare and present petitions to the house of commons, in case of grievances, and of the house of commons to receive the same.

It hath been always, time out of mind, the constant and uncontroverted usage and custom of the house of commons to have petitions presented to them from commoners, in case of grievance, public or private; in evidence whereof, it is one of the first works that is done by the house of commons, to appoint a grand committee to receive petitions and informations of grievances.

In case men should be punishable in other courts for preparing and presenting petitions for redress of grievances to the house of commons, it may discourage and deter his majesty's subjects from seeking redress of their grievances, and by that means frustrate the main and principal end for which parliaments were ordained.

Sir, what fuller evidence could be given, what stronger testimony adduced, of the importance which was attached in those early days to this *inherent* right of petition, or of the inviolable sanctity which belonged to it? What significance there is in the fact here stated, that "*it is one of the first works that is done by the house of commons, to appoint a grand committee to receive petitions and informations of grievances!*" What an emphasis in the idea, that "it may *discourage and deter* his majesty's subjects from seeking redress of their grievances, and *by that means frustrate the main and principal end for which parliaments were ordained!*" I imagine that no gentleman will desire further evidence as to the first proposition which I undertook to establish.

But where is the evidence that our fathers regarded this right of petition in the same light? Why, sir, it so happens that in the Congress of 1789, by which the amendments of the Constitution were agreed upon, this first article of amendment, which is in controversy in this debate, was the subject of some discussion. The adoption of it was opposed by some of the members of that Congress. But on what grounds was it opposed? Was it on the idea which has been held out in this debate, that it would be unbecoming in a free and sovereign people to present themselves in the attitude of petitioners to this House? Was it on the ground that the right of petition was not an American right, as was suggested by a gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think, during the last Congress? No. Our fathers of that day were fresh from the great conflicts and controversies of the revolution, and they understood what American rights were too well to broach such an idea as that. It was opposed on the ground that the right of petition already existed, and needed no new assertion. It was said that it was "a self-evident, inalienable right, which the people possessed." It was said that "it would never be called in question." While, on the other hand, it was contended by the advocates of the amendment, that although it was "an *inherent*, existing right," it would be well, from its very value, to give it the additional force and solemnity of a constitutional sanction.

The committee who framed this report (said Mr. Benson) proceeded on the principle that these rights belonged to the people. They conceived them to be inherent, and all that they meant to provide against was their being *infringed* by the government.

Need I add anything more, sir, on the second proposition which I undertook to maintain?

Let me hasten, then, to the principle of reception, and to those instances of *refusal to receive*, which have been cited by the honorable member from Alabama.

And first let me bring to the notice of the House a fact of no little significance upon this point of my argument, which I find in the history of the East India Company case, already referred to. Among the other resolutions reported to the house of commons on that occasion, was one in these words:

That it is the undoubted right and privilege of the house of commons to judge and determine touching the nature and matter of such petitions, how far they are fit or unfit to be received.

I can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the triumphant tone in which this resolution would have been introduced to the notice of the House, had it fallen under the eye of any one of the advocates of the rule under debate. I confess that, at first, I was not a little perplexed by it myself. True, it was open to the remark, that it was reported in the spirit of a protest against the assumption of the house of lords; and the other resolutions, by which it was preceded and followed, gave ample reason for believing, that it was only designed to deny the right of any body but themselves, to judge as to petitions presented to the commons, how far they were fit or unfit to be received. Still, the language of the resolution, as I have read it, is certainly not quite consistent with the doctrines I have undertaken to establish; and I plainly perceive the satisfaction with which it has been heard in some quarters of the House. But what will gentlemen say when they learn that before this resolution was adopted, the word "*received*" was stricken out, upon formal motion, and the word "*retained*" inserted in its place! This, sir, is the fact. Here is the record of it.* And no better proof could be furnished than is found in this deliberate change of phraseology, that those who made it were unwilling, after asserting so emphatically the inherent right of every commoner of England to present petitions to abridge and even annihilate that right in the next breath, by arrogating to themselves an unlimited right of judgment, how far these petitions were fit or unfit to be received. They claimed only the right to judge how far they were fit to be *retained*; and to retain, I need not say, *ex vi termini*, implies *reception*.

But how is it with the examples which have been cited of a direct *refusal to receive* in later days, and with the standing rules of the house of commons under which these examples have occurred?

It is true, sir, that two rules of this character were adopted by that body more than a century ago. One of them to the effect, "that they would receive no petitions against a bill, *actually pending*, for imposing taxes or duties." The other, "that they would receive no petitions for grants or appropriations of money relating to public service *not recommended by the crown.*" Now, these are the only rules of the kind which have ever been known to the parliamentary proceedings of England; and all the cases in which petitions, respectful in their terms, have been refused a reception, are found to be ranged under the authority of these two rules. And how am I to substantiate my position, that these rules are exceptions to the general principles and general practice of parliament, and furnish no justification of the rule of this House? I shall summon to my aid, for this purpose, the great authority upon all questions of parliamentary proceeding, *Mr. Hatsell*; from whose well-known work Mr. Jefferson compiled his Manual, and to whom the highest acknowledgments are paid in the preface to that Manual. Let Mr. Hatsell explain these rules, and the reasons of them, in his own words, and then let us hear what he has to say in addition:

We see from the foregoing instances, particularly from the precedents which are cited, and read on the 10th of April, 1733, that very soon after the revolution, the house found it necessary to establish a rule, "that they would not receive any petition against a bill, then depending, for imposing a tax or duty." The principle upon which this rule was adopted, appears to be this: that a tax generally extending in its effect over every part of the kingdom, and more or less affecting every individual, and in its nature necessarily and intentionally imposing a burden upon the people, it can answer no end or purpose whatever for any set of petitioners to state these consequences as a grievance to the house. The house of commons, before they come to a resolution which imposes a tax, cannot but know that it may very sensibly affect the commerce or manufacture upon which the duty is laid; but they cannot permit the inconvenience that may possibly be brought upon a particular branch of trade to weigh with them, when put in the balance with those advantages which are intended to result to the whole, and which the public necessities of the State demand from them. For these reasons it has been thought better, and more candid to the persons petitioning, at once to refuse receiving their petition, rather than by receiving it to give countenance to the application, and to mislead the petitioners into an idea, that in consequence of their petition the house of commons would desist from the tax proposed, and impose another, which, though it might be less felt by that branch of trade, might be more oppressive to some other branch.

Upon an accurate examination of the numerous precedents cited on the 10th April, 1733, (in favor of the doctrine which was then laid down by Mr. Sandys, and those who supported the petition of the city of London) out of seventy-nine cases which were then produced and read, it will be found there are but three which apply to this question. The first of these is the petition against a bill for imposing a duty of 10 per cent. *ad valorem* upon the woolen manufacture in the year 1696–7. The resolution of the committee of ways and means upon this point, brought such a cloud of petitions from all parts of the kingdom—not only from those who were immediately concerned in the woolen trade, but from others who thought they might be ultimately affected by it—that it was thought advisable not even to present the bill. And in the very next session, in April and June, 1698, the house, having felt the inconveniency resulting from admitting these petitions, peremptorily refused to receive the petitions which were then offered against the taxes at that time depending.

In the following note to this passage, the rule is still further explained:

What Mr. Winnington afterwards said in the debate upon the petition against the bill relating to the trade of the sugar colonies, proved true upon this occasion. "If we were to receive all petitions against bills that are brought in for the laying on of any new duties, there would be such multitudes of them against every such bill, that the nation might be undone for want of an immediate supply for the public use, whilst we are sitting to hear frivolous petitions against bills brought in for granting that supply." Common Debates, vol. vii. p. 310. This reasoning does not apply to the receiving petitions which desire the repeal or alteration of taxes imposed in any former session; no public service is delayed by receiving and considering such petitions; nor can the time of the house be employed more properly than in endeavoring to lighten the burdens which have been necessarily imposed upon the people, by introducing such regulations, in the manner of collecting the taxes, as experience shall point out; or even by repealing taxes, in instances where no regulation can make them fit to be continued.

And now let us hear Mr. Hatsell's account of the second of these rules:

The great number of petitions that were presented to the house of commons, at the commencement of the session, which began in October, 1705, from persons either claiming an arrear of pay as officers, or making some other demand upon the public, made it necessary for the house to put some restriction upon these applications; which, their being often promoted by members who were friends to the parties, and carrying with them the appearance of justice or of charity, induced the rest of the house to wish well to, or at most to be indifferent to their success; and by this means, large sums were granted to private persons, improvidently, and sometimes without sufficient grounds. Very early, therefore, in the next session, on the 11th of December, 1706, before any petitions of this sort could be again offered, the house came to a resolution, "that they would receive no petition for any sum of money relating to public service, but what is recommended from the crown." This resolution not being at that time made a standing one, had no effect beyond the session in which it was passed, so that soon after the practice returned again; and (the same mischiefs resulting from it) the house, upon the 11th of June, 1713, ordered the resolution of the 11th of December to be read, and declared it to be a standing order of the house. From this time, whenever any petition which desires relief by public money is offered, or any motion is made to this purpose, before the speaker puts the question for bringing up the petition, it has been the practice, in conformity to this order, that the recommendation of the crown should be signified by some member authorized so to do; and if the chancellor of the exchequer, or person usually authorized by the crown, declines to signify this recommendation, the house cannot properly receive the petition. It has sometimes happened that the chancellor of the exchequer has, from motives of humanity, and in order not to preclude the house from taking a petition under their consideration, given the recommendation of the crown, in cases of which, even at the time, he acknowledged his disapprobation. This conduct, from whatever motives it may proceed, is not to be approved of. It destroys the meaning and spirit of the order, and reduces it to a mere form. The resolution of the 11th of December has no other intention than to transfer the responsibility of receiving or refusing the petition from the house to the ministers of the crown. Unless, therefore, the ministers will do their duty, by examining into the nature of the claim, and the propriety of granting any relief; and if they find the application unfounded, will have the courage to inform the house of the result of their opinion, it would be better that the standing order should be repealed, and that the house should be left to act in these, as in other circumstances, without restraint or control.

It will be perceived, sir, from these passages, that neither of these rules of the British parliament go the length of the rule of this house. Neither of them provides that petitions of a certain class shall not be received at any time, or under any circumstances, or be entertained in any way whatever.—The first declares only that petitions against a tax bill shall not be received *while that bill is actually pending*; and this, on the ground that the nation might be undone for want of an immediate supply for the public service, while parliament was occupied in hearing petitions against some particular mode of raising that supply. And it is expressly admitted that petitions for the repeal or alteration of these same taxes, may subsequently be received. The second of these rules stops equally short of an entire exclusion of a certain class of petitions. Its whole intention and operation is to throw upon the ministry the responsibility of all appropriations of public money. It substantially *refers* all the petitions to which it relates to the advisers of the crown, (themselves members of parliament,) and makes them a committee to receive and consider them. And it expressly provides that, with their endorsement, these very petitions shall be received and considered by the house. What sort of analogy is there between rules like these, and a rule which declares that petitions on certain enumerated topics shall not be received at any time, or under any circumstances, or be entertained in any way whatever?

But what does Mr. Hatsell say further on the subject of these rules? "The house," he says, in commenting on one of them, "ought to be particularly cautious not to be over-rigid in extending this rule beyond what the practice of their ancestors in former times can justify them in. TO RECEIVE, AND HEAR, AND CONSIDER the petitions of their fellow-subjects, when presented decently, and containing no matter intentionally offensive to the house, IS A DUTY incumbent upon them, ANTECEDENT TO ALL RULES AND ORDERS that may have been instituted for their own convenience. Justice and the laws of their country demand it from them."

Here, Mr. Speaker, is laid down, in the clearest and noblest phraseology, in words which, after the principles that have so often been advanced, and the practice which has so long prevailed here, ought to be emblazoned in letters of gold upon every column in this hall, and to be suspended on a scroll of silver from the very beak of the eagle above your head—the true parliamentary and constitutional doctrine on the subject of petitions.

But, before enlarging upon this idea, I must say a few words in defense of the fourth proposition which I promised to prove, viz: that there is abundant reason for believing that the framers of our Constitution would have been the last persons to acquiesce in the exceptions to this doctrine which are contained in the two special rules which have just been cited. Why, is it forgotten that our fathers had some experience of their own on this subject of the reception of petitions? Is it forgotten that the Declaration of Independence itself, after rejecting the various oppressions to which the American colonies had been subjected, goes on to state, that "in every stage of these oppressions, we have *petitioned* for redress in the most humble terms: our repeated petitions have been answered by repeated injury!" Is it forgotten that Patrick Henry, of Virginia, in that celebrated speech, which is at the tongue's end of every schoolboy in the Union, and in which he comes to the stern and glaring conclusion, "we must fight," presents it as the very climax of his description of the unutterable grievances of that day, "we have petitioned, we have remonstrated, we have supplicated: our petitions have been slighted, our remonstrances disregarded, and we have been spurned with contempt from the foot of the throne?" It is an historical fact, that the petitions of our fathers were refused a reception in the British parliament. And on what ground were they refused? Upon what principle were they denied a hearing, or any entertainment whatever? Sir, it was in conformity with these very precedents which have been cited here so triumphantly! It was under these very rules which are appealed to so confidently in justification of our rule! Here is the record of the fact:

18. On the 15th of February, 1765, a petition of Mr. Montague, agent for Virginia, and a perition from Connecticut, and another from the inhabitants of Carolina, against the bill then depending, for imposing a stamp duty in America, being offered, upon the question for bringing them up, it passed in the negative.

And now will any gentleman undertake to maintain that the framers of the Constitution intended to give their assent to principles, under which their own petitions against the stamp act were refused a reception? Will any gentleman rely on these precedents, while the words of Patrick Henry, and the language of the Declaration, are still fresh in his memory? No, sir, I am sure I need not urge this point further.

Let me recur, then, for a moment, to the admirable exposition of Mr. Hatsell: "To receive, and hear, and consider the petitions of their fellow-subjects, when presented decently, and containing no matter intentionally offensive to the house, is a duty incumbent upon them, antecedent to all rules and orders that may have been instituted for their own convenience. Justice and the laws of our country demand it of them." This sentence, I repeat, contains, in the noblest terms, the true constitutional and parliamentary principle. It embraces the whole rule, and the only rule; the whole exception and the only exception to the rule—the rule being that petitions shall be received, heard, and considered; and the exception relating exclusively to such as are not decently presented, or such as contain matter intentionally offensive to the house.

[Mr. Winthrop was here interrupted by the expiration of the morning hour, and the subject was laid over until the following day.]

The orders of the day having been called for by Mr. Adams, Mr. Winthrop proceeded with his remarks. He said, that when he was cut off yesterday, he was proceeding to make some comments on the golden rule which had been laid down on the subject of petitions by Mr. *Hatsell*, who, by all acknowledgment, was the highest authority on the subject of parliamentary principles and parliamentary precedents; and who had been styled by Mr. Jefferson, "the pre-eminent authority" on such matters. It will be observed (said Mr. W.) that this rule contains no sanction for the doctrine which has so often been advanced here, that petitions are not to be received, because there may seem to be no authority to grant the prayer of them. And where, let me ask, where would such a doctrine lead us, in these days, and in this country? Where would it lead us in this House, and at this very moment? Why, sir, there is an undoubted majority of this body, who hold that Congress have no constitutional authority to establish a national bank; no constitutional authority to carry on a system of internal improvements; no constitutional authority to distribute among the States the proceeds of the public lands. I am by no means sure that there is a majority here who would dare to assert, in positive terms, the power of Congress to protect American labor. We all know that, in the changes of parties and of party opinions in this country, this Constitution of ours is one thing to-day, and another thing to-morrow; a straight-jacket (as an honorable member from Virginia has termed it) to one set of men, and a charter, wide withal as the wind, to another set of men. Some of us maintain that the power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia, is as clear and as unqualified, as its power to regulate commerce, or to support a navy. Others hold, on the contrary, that an *exclusive jurisdiction, in all cases whatsoever*, does not extend to the case of slavery. In the meantime, some are of opinion that there is a power in this government to annex Texas to the Union; while others, (and myself among the number,) maintain, that such an annexation would be a plain and palpable violation of the Constitution, and an utter violation of what little there is left, on our side, at least, of the old, original compromises, on which that Constitution was adopted. Where, I repeat, would the doctrine end, that petitions are not to be received, if they ask for anything which an existing majority here may deem it unconstitutional to grant? It is plain that the power to grant the prayer of a petition, is a question to be considered; and the petition must be received and heard, in order that this question may be considered. It is always, let me add, in the power of Congress to propose amendments to the Constitution. Perhaps the consideration of a petition may lead to such propositions. Perhaps this may be the very design and object of the petitioners. This idea alone is an ample answer to the suggestion, that a supposed or even a real want of power to grant them, is ground enough for a summary refusal to receive petitions.

But this golden rule of Mr. Hatsell's, it will be perceived, does not stop short at the reception of petitions. It declares it to be a duty incumbent on us, antecedent to all rules and orders for our own convenience, to hear and consider them. And for myself, I do not desire to have the rule of this House changed at all, if it be not changed so as to meet and embrace this whole principle. As to receiving petitions for the purpose of laying them instantly on the table, it is a mere evasion of the principle, and a mere mockery of the parties. The original excitement on this subject, sprung up under such a rule as that would be; and a return to it would do nothing, nothing whatever, to allay that excitement. In this one point, therefore, I agree with the honorable member from Alabama; let us have the present rule, or none. I would only reverse the order of the alternatives, and say, let us have no rule, or let this rule stand as it is.

But, says the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Rhett,) where does this duty to consider a petition, terminate? How much consideration do you claim? If you demand to have your petitions received, and heard, and considered, why not to have them referred, why not to have them reported on, why not to have them *granted?* Now, sir, I readily admit that it is difficult to lay down, in advance, the precise line of demarcation between the right of petition and the right of legislation; to say exactly where the one ends, and the other begins; or to fix the precise measure of consideration which will fulfill the one, without infringing on the other. But this difficulty does not prevent our confounding the plainest and most obvious distinctions. It was well said by Mr. Burke, in one of his speeches or essays, that, "though no man can draw a stroke between the confines of night and day, yet darkness and light are upon the whole, tolerably distinguishable." So here, though it may puzzle us to put down, in black and white, the exact boundary line between the right of the petitioner and the right of the legislator, yet the consideration of a prayer, and the granting of a prayer, are, "upon the whole, tolerably distinguishable." Indeed, there is no degree, no gradation, no middle term, between the two ideas. But why, why all this metaphysical subtlety as to a certain class of petitions? You do not refuse to receive other petitions, lest you should be ensnared into some unavoidable obligation to grant them. Heaven knows that there are adverse reports enough made and adopted in this House, in reference to petitions which we uniformly receive and consider. Petitions for pensions; petitions for the allowance of the most just claims; petitions for the payment of the most undeniable debts; why, sir, we make no bones of despatching a hundred of them in a morning, on a private bill day. Whence, then, all this anxiety and alarm, lest the reception of the petitions enumerated in the rule under debate should precipitate us upon some irresistible necessity to grant their prayer?

Mr. Speaker, we ask for these petitions only that you will treat them as you treat other petitions. We set up for them no absurd or extravagant pretensions. We claim for them no exclusive or engrossing attention. We desire only that you will adopt no proscriptive and passionate course, in regard to them. We demand only that you will allow them to go through the same orderly round of reception, reference, and report, with all other petitions. When they have gone through that round, they will be just as much under your own control as they were before they entered on it.

I heartily hope, sir, that this course is now about to be adopted. I hope it as an advocate of the right of petition. I hope it as a northern man with northern principles, if you please to term me so. But I hope it not less as an American citizen with American principles; as a friend to the Constitution and the Union; as one who is as little disposed to interfere with any rights of other States, as to surrender any rights of his own State; as one who, though he may see provisions of the Constitution which are odious in principle, and unjust in practice—provisions which he would gladly have had omitted at the outset, and gladly see altered now, if such an alteration were practicable—is yet willing to stand by *our Constitution as it is, our Union as it is, our Territory as it is!* I do honestly believe that the course of this House, in relation to these petitions, has done more than all other causes combined to bring the Constitution into disregard, and the Union into danger. Other causes have indeed co-operated with this cause. Your arbitrary and oppressive State laws for imprisoning our free colored seamen in the southern ports; your abhorrent proposals to annex Texas to the Union, in violation of the compromises of the Constitution; yes, sir, of those very compromises on which Adams and Hancock met Jefferson and Madison, (to use language which was employed in casting reproach upon the resolutions of Massachusetts which were recently presented here;) these laws and these proposals have unquestionably co-operated of late with the denial of the right of petition, in exciting in some quarters a spirit of discontent with our existing system. But this rule of the House has been the original spring of the whole feeling. And to what advantage, on the part of those by whom it was devised? Have southern institutions been any safer since its establishment? Have the enemies to those institutions been rendered any less ardent, or less active by it? Has agitation on the subject of slavery in this hall been repressed or allayed by it? Have these petitions and resolutions been diminished in number, under its operation and influence? No, sir; the very reverse, the precise opposite of all this, has been the result. The attempt of this House to suppress and silence all utterance on the subject of slavery, in this hall, has terminated as did the attempt of one of the ancient kings of Judah to suppress the warnings of the prophet of God. The prophet, we are told, took another roll, and wrote on it all the words which the king had burned in the fire, and "*there were added besides unto them many like words!*" And this always has been, and always will be, the brief history of every effort to silence free inquiry and stifle free discussion. I thank Heaven that it is so. It is this inherent and inextinguishable elasticity of opinion, of conscience, of inquiry, which, like the great agent of modern art, gains

liberty it has yet acquired, and to which it will owe all that is yet in store for it. Well did John Milton exclaim, in his noble defense of unlicensed printing, "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, above all liberties;" for, in securing that, we secure the all-sufficient instrument for achieving all other liberties.

[Mr. Winthrop's hour here expired.]

NOTE.

The proceedings of the house of commons, in the case of Skinner and the East India Company, as they stood upon the journals before they were expunged by the order of the king, are inserted, as follows, in the appendix to the third volume of Hatsell's Precedents, (London edition, 1818.)

Die Sabbati, 4 *Decembris*, 1669.

The house, then, according to former order, resumed the debate of the matter concerning trials and privileges in parliament.

The house of commons being informed that Sir Samuel Bernardiston, a commoner of England, has been called before the house of lords, and hath had a judgment passed upon him, and a fine imposed, and a record made thereof in the exchequer, mentioning the fine to be paid:

Resolved, &c. That a conference be desired of the lords upon the matter aforesaid, and other proceedings relating thereunto; and, also, upon the proceedings concerning Thomas Skinner and the East India Company.

Resolved, &c. That a committee be appointed to prepare and draw up reasons, to be insisted upon at the conference to be had with the lords touching the matter aforesaid, viz: Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Sergeant Maynard, &c.; and the special care of this matter is recommended to Mr. Solicitor General, Sir Robert Howard, and Sir Thomas Lee.

Die Martis, 7 *Decembris*, 1669.

Ordered, That the report of Sir Robert Howard, from the committee appointed to prepare reasons to be used at the conference with the lords, be heard this day, next after the report from the committee of elections.

Sir Robert Howard reports from the committee appointed to prepare and bring in reasons to be insisted upon at the conference to be had with the lords, in the matter relating to the East India Company and Skinner and Sir Samuel Bernardiston, that the committee had met according to the commands of the house, and had taken deliberate consideration of the whole matter, but found they were disabled to prepare reasons without a ground-work of some particular heads agreed by the house, to the justification whereof the reasons might be applied; and that the committee had prepared some heads, drawn up into five several resolves, which he read in his place, and tendered to the house for their approbation; and the same being again read, are as followeth, viz:

1. That it is an inherent right of every commoner of England, to prepare and present petitions to the house of commons, in case of grievance, and the house of commons to receive the same.

2. That it is the undoubted right and privilege of the house of commons to judge and determine touching the nature and matter of such petitions, how far they are fit or unfit to be received.

3. That no court whatsoever hath power to judge or censure any petition prepared for or presented to the house of commons, and received by them, unless transmitted from thence, or the matter complained of by them.

4. Whereas, a petition by the governor and company of merchants trading to East India, was presented to the house of commons by Sir Samuel Bernardiston and others, complaining of grievances therein, which the lords have censured under the notion of a scandalous paper or libel; that the said censure and proceedings of the lords against the said Sir Samuel Bernardiston are contrary to, and in subversion of, the rights and privileges of the house of commons, and liberties of the commons of England.

5. That the continuance upon record of the judgment given by the lords, and complained of by the house of commons, in the last session of this parliament, in the case of Thomas Skinner and the East India Company, is prejudicial to the rights of the commoners of England.

Ordered, That the report delivered in by Sir Robert Howard be taken into consideration, the first business to-morrow morning.

Die Mercurii, 8 *Decembris*, 1669.

The house then resumed the consideration of the report of Sir Robert Howard, of the heads and proposals brought in from the committee appointed to draw up reasons to be insisted on at the conference to be had with the lords in the matter concerning the East India Company and Skinner and Sir Samuel Bernardiston.

The first head was twice read, and, with the addition of the word "of," upon the question, agreed to.

The second head was read twice; and, with the alteration of the word "retain" for "receive," upon the question, agreed.

The third proposition was twice read, and some amendments made thereto.

The question being put, to agree to this proposition—

The house divided.

The noes went out.

Tellers:

Mr. Morice, Mr. Steward, } For the yeas, 109.

Sir J. Talbot, Col. Reames, } For the noes, 73.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

The fourth proposition was twice read; and the words "under the notion of," omitted, and the word "as," inserted in the stead of it; and the proposition thus amended, upon the question, agreed.

The fifth proposition was read twice; and, upon the question, agreed—

1. That it is an inherent right of every commoner of England to prepare and present petitions to the house of commons, in case of grievance, and of the house of commons to receive the same.

2. That it is the undoubted right and privilege of the house of commons to judge and determine, touching the nature and matter of such petitions, how far they are fit or unfit to be retained.

3. That no court whatsoever hath power to judge or censure any petition prepared for, or presented to and received by, the house of commons, unless transmitted from thence, or the matter is complained of by them.

4. That whereas a petition, by the governor and company of merchants trading to the East Indies, was presented to the house of commons by Sir Samuel Bernardiston and others, complaining of grievance therein, which the lords have censured as a scandalous paper or libel; the said censure and proceedings of the lords against the said Sir Samuel Bernardiston, are contrary to, and in subversion of, the rights and privileges of the house of commons, and liberties of the commons of England.

5. That the continuance upon record of the judgment given by the lords, and complained of by the house of commons, in the last session of this parliament, in the case of Thomas Skinner and the East India Company, is prejudicial to the rights of the commons of England.

Resolved, That the committee formally appointed to draw up reasons to be used at the conference with the lords, be revived, and do sit this afternoon, and prepare reasons and arguments to justify the propositions agreed to, and prepare and propose what is fit to be offered or desired of the lords; and that these members following be added to said committee, viz: Sir Walter Gouge, Mr. Seymour, &c.

Die Veneris, 10 *Decembris*, 1669.

Sir Robert Howard reports from the committee to which it was referred, to prepare and draw up reasons to be used at the conference with the lords, in the matter of the East India Company and Skinner and Sir Samuel Bernardiston, to justify the resolves of this house; and also two propositions thereupon to be made to the lords, which he read, and after delivered the same in at the clerk's table; and the same being twice read, and with some amendment, upon the question, agreed, are as followeth:

To the first, second, and third, depending on one another:

1. It hath been always, time out of mind, the constant and uncontroverted usage and custom of the house of commons to have petitions presented to them from commoners, in case of grievance, public or private: in evidence whereof, it is one of the first works that is done by the house of commons to appoint a grand committee to receive petitions and informations of grievances.

2. That in no age that we can find, ever any person, who presented any grievance, by way of petition, to the house of commons, which was received by them, was ever censured by the lords, without complaint of the commons.

3. That no suitors for justice, in any inferior court whatsoever, in law or equity, exhibiting their complaint for any matters proper to be proceeded upon in that court, are therefore punishable criminally, though untrue, or suable by way of action in any other court wheresoever; but are only subject to a moderate fine or amercement by that court, unless in some cases specially provided for by act of parliament, as appeals, or the like.

4. In case men should be punishable in other courts for preparing and presenting petitions for redress of grievances to the house of commons, it may discourage and deter his majesty's subjects from seeking redress of their grievances, and by that means frustrate the main and principal end for which perliaments were ordained.

To the fourth proposition:

1. That no petition, nor any other matter depending in the house of commons, can be taken notice of by the lords without breach of privilege, unless communicated by the house of commons.

2. Upon conclusion of the four first propositions, it is further to be alledged that the house of peers (as well as other courts) are, in all their judicial proceedings, to be guarded and limited by law; but if they should give a wrong sentence, contrary to law, and the party grieved might not seek redress thereof in full parliament, and to that end repair to the house of commons, who are part of the legislative power, that either they may interpose with their lordships for the reversal of such sentence, or prepare a bill for that purpose, and for the preventing the like grievance for the time to come—the consequence thereof would plainly be, both that their lordships' judicature would be boundless, and above law, and that the party grieved should be without remedy.

As to the fifth proposition: The committee refer to the former reasons offered against the judgment of the lords against the East India Company, in the last session of parliament.

Curious Logic.—The Montreal Courier cites the present wretched condition of Spain as an instance of what *Democracy* will do for a country. Democracy! We thought Spain was a monarchy, and that its troubles arose mainly from the hereditary occupancy of the throne by a girl of thirteen.

No use for Humanity.—The Nashua Telegraph, in allusion to the *talking* machine, facetiously remarks, "There will soon be no use for humanity. Machines have been invented for about everything. When that for setting types is completed, we do not see but what the human family may as well *adjourn*. There will be but precious little for them to do, if they stay here. The whole process of civilization will go on without them."

Communications.

CLINTON SEMINARY.

This institution is located in the thriving and pleasant village of Clinton, nine miles southwest of the city of Utica.

The prospect commands a most beautiful landscape scenery, for many miles up and down the valley of the Mohawk; and also for a considerable distance beyond it; embracing a long chain of romantic hills, which form the northern boundary of this valley. The locality is very desirable; and when combined with other important advantages, peculiar to this school, make it extremely delightful to the student.

It was first founded by the Presbyterians, exclusively for girls, about eight years ago; and was based on the principles of modern abolition. In 1841, it was purchased by the Freewill Baptists, and since that time it has been under their administration. Notwithstanding the ceasless tide of popular prejudice which has been constantly rolling upon it, from almost every quarter, on account of the unwavering principles of true morality and universal justice, upon which it is based, it has nevertheless continued a straight-forward course, consistent with the principles of its founders and warmest advocates, disregarding the sneers and scoffs of the prejudiced multitude. The number of students exceed one hundred, half of which are girls. As its doors have been thrown wide open to down-trodden humanity, the colored man is admitted on a perfect equality with the white students. At present, we have but one colored person in the school; the son of a Baptist minister of New-York, by the name of Dutton. There are three school terms in a year; consisting of fourteen weeks each. Two of the vacations, viz:—Spring and fall, are each two weeks long; and the summer vacation, which commences in July, is of six weeks duration, thus allowing the students sufficient time to visit their homes, if they wish. If not, there is every accommodation for them at the institution, where they are furnished with board at the very reasonable price of $1.25 per week, (if they drink *tea* and *coffee*,) or $1.00 with those drinks excepted. Students who are desirous of economizing, or those who have not the means of carrying them through a regular course of study, can be accommodated with rooms on very reasonable terms, either furnished or otherwise, in which to board themselves. Several students have of late tried this plan, much to their satisfaction.

There are several literary societies connected with the institution; two of which belong exclusively to the men's department, and one to the women's. The latter have also a sewing circle, the proceeds of which are applied to benevolent purposes; principally in aiding such students as are unable to defray their own expenses. The above societies have papers, which they issue, generally semi-monthly, upon their own responsibility. One great advantage, which this institution enjoys over many others, is its free communication with Hamilton college, which is about a mile and a half distant. Clinton students are admitted gratuitously to the college lectures and libraries. I hope this hasty account will convey some idea of the general character of this seminary. Some of the most influential citizens of this place betray an aristocratic bias, but the mass of intelligence is in favor of modern equalizing reforms.

Thine, truly,

MORTON PENNOCK.

LETTER FROM DR. HUDSON.

I have refrained some time from communicating to you my heart-burnings respecting the gross wrongs and inhuman oppressions practised by the people of this nation, upon two and a half millions of our brethren in bonds. *My heart is hot within me*, in view of humanity chattelized, and eternal truth mocked to scorn. Surely every man walketh in a vain show; professing a regard for the rights of man, "writing good news upon a bloody leaf," crying Liberty, Liberty, while in his works he destroys liberty, and passes by his brethren, in chains, tears, and blood.

What class of oppressors are so contemptible, so deserving of public execration, as that which appears under the garb of Christian, democrat, and republican; who seek to clothe their acts of villany by seeming to be saints, "when most they serve the devil;" who join hypocrisy to despotism, and lying to gross injustice; who, with their mouths, *make many prayers*, and in their acts turn judgment away backward, and cause justice to stand afar off; who close the doors of Church and State upon truth, and ruthlessly trample humanity into the earth.

What man could more perfectly represent such a people, than *John Tyler?* He talks loudly about liberty, the rights of all men, and execrates British oppressors; he, too, professes a great regard for Christianity, talks about the fear of God, and love to our neighbors; and to avert the thunderbolts of Heaven, he says to his constituents, let us bow down our heads, put on demure and sanctimonious faces, and proclaim a nation's *fast*. Thus he talks and does, while his iron heel is on the necks of fifty of God's poor children, crushing them into the dust. Thus the people—Christian, democratic and republican—say, and do, who at the same time refuse to cease to do evil, to remove their national heel off from the millions of their countrymen, whom they are treading down upon the soil which they are compelled to till unrequited.

The living power of liberty and truth is sacrificed by the great mass of the people; bleeding, suffering humanity is made subservient to the interests of the political and ecclesiastical confederations and political parties. Anti-slavery, like Ithuriel's spear, has wrought a glaring exhibition of this ruling spirit insatiate, in every part of this nation. I'll give a case to illustrate, which recently occurred in South Leverett, in Franklin county. A tried and true fried of humanity sent a notice for an anti-slavery lecture, to one of the ruling members in the church, with a request that he would hand it to the minister to publish; which he agreed to do. On further consideration, he became exceedingly alarmed, lest the voice of humanity, if allowed a hearing there, might affect the consciences of the people, unseasonably for the interest of "our party" in the congressional election, which was to come off in a few days.

Though it was "*Sabba day*," and he felt quite inimical to hearing holy and secular concerns united on that day, and especially horrified at Gerrit Smith's impiety in preaching politics on that day, he summoned the chief rulers to sit in council on the case. With one accord they cried out, "This babbler who is turning the world upside down, is coming hither also, to interfere with 'our party's' success." The notice was pocketed, and they went up to their synagogue to worship. To secure the election of their candidate, which *justice and truth* could not "sanction and sanctify," because of his disregard of human rights, these pseudo-republicans and democrats came to a deliberate determination to walk desperately over both, throwing aside the object of all just and righteous legislation.

For an apology, they offered, that Mr. —— was in favor of the *right of petition*, and would vote against the *gag-rule*. Here is another betrayal of the selfish spirit of political partisans and confederates. What right have I to have my interests and rights represented exclusively, while *all* of my neighbors' rights, which have long, long been despoiled, are not only totally neglected, but continually and most brutally trampled on by every representative in our national legislature, who confederates with men-thieves and robbers. *Right of petition cleft down!* What is that, but the legitimate effect of the *peculiar institution* of our government, which every man *swears to sustain*, before he can possibly represent the people, or hold an office in the United States government. What are my interests, but my neighbor's interests? and how can my interests, which are identical with my neighbor's, be represented, while my neighbor's are annihilated? a perfect paradox. Can any man, or body of men, represent my rights and interests, while trampling the heaven-endowed rights of any man under foot? Can any people enjoy the blessings of liberty, or have any regard for the principles of freedom, while they are helping to enslave others? Can any people be happy, or prosperous, while they are causing the hearts of their fellow-men to bleed, and to be filled with wretchedness? Can any people be entitled to the name of Christian, democrat, or republican, while they are daily and hourly perpetrating the vilest of crimes against *man*, and the grossest outrage against God? Is not this government, by its own laws, a *pirate* of human rights? Does it not riot over human hearts and blood? Do not the political parties vie with each other in rendering the grossest servility to the government? Do not the people compose these parties? Where is their honesty, their regard for either humane or moral principle? Where is the fear of God, or regard for man, exhibited by them? Do they expect that their plea of compact, "party interest," or policy, will avail them, when the poor slave shall appear before them, (like Banquo's ghost before his murderer,) as a witness at the court of Heaven? Every man must be, of necessity, an enemy to himself and to his country, who will make human rights a secondary concern—who, to obtain the election of a favorite candidate, the ascendancy of a party, the perpetuity of a sect, the establishment of a bank, a subtreasury, or a tariff, will sacrifice the sacred cause of liberty. The decree of heaven is, "they that spoil their neighbor, shall be spoiled themselves; they that deal treacherously, shalt be dealt treacherously with;" the immutability of which, the North and South are dearly experiencing, morally, religiously, and pecuniarily. Can any government be built upon human bones, and compacted with human gore, and long withstand the frowns of Heaven? Priests and people, praying for pious rulers! and rulers paying them for so doing; and then all declare, by their ballot-box deeds, like Cardinal Richlieu, that no honest man, or one who fears God, and regards man, will they knowingly employ, or sanction in the employ of the United States government. Instead of delighting in justice, and showing mercy, the great mass of people delight in the black art of dealing in injustice and cruelty? Can any man, who sustains American slavery, and makes any other profession than that of despotism and antichrist, be anything more than a moral counterfeit, of the grossest character? I tremble for my country and countrymen, "when I remember that God is just, and that justice cannot sleep forever;" and that "there will be a judgment, just, though awful, to the rioters on human privileges, and the pirates of human rights."

Thine, in the cause of liberty,

E. D. HUDSON.

TALES OF OPPRESSION.

BY ISAAC T. HOPPER.

No. LXXVIII.

A person by the name of Wallace, a wealthy planter in Virginia, took a tour to the North and East, accompanied by his wife and two daughters. After visiting Quebec, and some of the cities in New England, they arrived in Philadelphia, in the autumn, about the year 1804, and took lodgings at the well-known inn, called the "Indian Queen," in South Fourth street. They concluded to spend the winter in that city, for the purpose of enjoying the popular amusements of the place, among the fashionables of the city. They had with them a favorite family servant to wait upon them. During their sojourn there, they were careful to keep him from forming acquaintance with any of the colored people, fearing they might induce him to leave their service. They remained in Philadelphia till late in the ensuing spring, when they made preparations for returning to Virginia. I shall call the servant Tom; for I believe that was his name, though it is so long since the circumstances occurred, that I am not certain. Tom had been long enough in Philadelphia to become attached to the place, and his master discovered that he was extremely reluctant to return to Virginia. To prevent difficulty, he had him arrested, and placed in prison. He was committed in the evening. The next morning, the keeper sent and informed me that a colored man had been committed to prison as a slave, who he thought had a legal right to his freedom. Soon after receiving this information, I had an interview with the prisoner. He was about thirty-five or forty years old, and had resided with Wallace from early childhood. He made no complaint of hard treatment, but was very desirous of being free. I inquired of him why he was so unwilling to return to Virginia, inasmuch as he did not complain of bad usage. He replied, "Everybody wishes to be free. If master dies, I shall be sold, and may be sent to Georgia." I discovered, on interrogating him, that he had been in Philadelphia more than six months. I then informed him that he was a free man, and that I would protect him. He clasped his hands with deep emotion, and in an instant his face was suffused with tears. His joy was inexpressible. I stepped into the keeper's office, and drew up a petition for a habeas corpus. While I was writing it, the keeper informed me that his master had gone to the magistrate who committed him, to get a discharge; and that he intended to send him off immediately. He added, "Be as expeditious as possible. If he comes with it, I will detain the man till you return, tf you don't stay more than an hour." I proceeded forthwith to the court house near by, where the supreme court was then in session. I gave my petition to Joseph Hopkinson, who was then in court, to present. It was addressed "To Edward Shippen, chief justice of the supreme court of the State of Pennsylvania, and his associates." Hopkinson, after looking over it, remarked, "You must let me add 'To the honorable.'" This I declined, and he refused to present it to the court. I then stepped up and said, "I hold in my hand a petition for a habeas corpus; I gave it to my friend, Joseph Hopkinson, to present; but he declined doing so, because it is not couched in the usual terms, 'To the honorable.' I presume I have as honorable an opinion of this court as my friend Hopkinson; but it is an epithet that is often misapplied, and one which I have conscientious objections to using. I hope this court will not deny justice to the man, on whose behalf I make this application, on account of my conscientious scruples. Unless the habeas corpus is issued immediately, the man will be taken out of the jurisdiction of this court." As soon as I took my seat, Sampson Levy, counsel for the claimant, rose and said, "I hope the court will not suffer that petition to be read. The proceeding is irregular. The court have been told that Mr. Hopkinson has declined to present it. Mr. Hopkinson is one of the counsel of the abolition society, and if there had been no objection, but that mentioned, he doubtless would have cheerfully attended to the business." I remarked, "Joseph Hopkinson is present, he can speak for himself." He then rose and confirmed my statement. Levy commenced a speech, which I soon discovered was likely to occupy considerable time. I rose, and asked the court to permit me to interrupt the counsel one minute. I remarked, "I repeat that unless a habeas corpus is issued *immediately*, the man will be out of the jurisdiction of the court. I suppose his claimant is now at the prison, waiting to take him away." Judge Yates, as soon as I had done speaking, said, "Read your petition." I read it. He then said, "Take your writ." I was soon furnished with it, and immediately went to the prison, where I found Wallace, and Richard Hunt, a constable, with their manacles ready to fetter Tom and carry him off. Upon exhibiting the writ, I received, as was customary in such cases, a volley of abuse from Wallace and his officer. They demanded their man, and threatened the keeper with prosecution, unless he immediately gave up the prisoner. As soon as he could make out the return to the writ, we all proceeded to the court-house. Upon arriving there, J. Hopkinson said, "Now I will attend to the case for you." I replied, "I thank thee, I shall not need thy services."

I had, in court, one of the servants from the hotel, where Wallace and his family lodged, to prove the length of time they had been in the city. I had also subpœned the bar-keeper. Upon looking round the room I saw the landlord. Wallace had anticipated difficulty, and had previously provided himself with counsel. Soon after the man appeared in court, the case was called on. In the meantime, the bar keeper made his appearance. He testified most clearly the time of their arrival in the city, and that they had remained there ever since. I then called upon the landlord, who with much reluctance confirmed the same facts. I observed that if it was necessary, we could produce additional testimony, but that I presumed the court was now satisfied. Levy asked the witnesses no questions. After a few minutes, the man was discharged.

As I was leaving the court-room, J. Hopkinson said to me, "Isaac, you have got the impudence of the devil: they should have made a lawyer of you." "Is that a necessary constituent in the character of a lawyer?" replied I. And so we parted.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEB'Y. 29, 1844

THE NORTHERN DEMOCRATIC LEADERS.

We have repeatedly expressed our confidence in the honesty and humanity of the mass of the northern democrats. We have also expressed the hope, a hope ardently cherished for a period of fifteen years, that the effect of the zealous, honest, and unselfish presentation to them, through lectures, popular meetings, and the press, of the enlarged and corrected edition of the real democratic principles, comprehended in the anti-slavery cause, would be to cut asunder the body of that party, and its huckstering and corrupt leaders, the servile and miserable hangers-on upon the patronage of the slave-king—the creeping panders to the "bawdy and bloody" monster—the spotted traitors to liberty, truth, and their too credulous constituents. Recently, we did think that the long-desired moment of party disenthralment, and of the triumphant vindication of the clearest popular rights, long trampled down by the iron heel of the slave-breeding feudality, was at hand. The stand taken by the most enlightened, independent, and humane portion of Van Buren's northern friends in Congress, did seem to us to augur the most auspicious results. It certainly gave a shock to slave supremacy, unprecedented in the history of the government. We welcomed this event with joy and gratitude. For the sake of the "tortured slave," our sincere homage was paid to those democrats to whom humanity was indebted for this hopeful demonstration. But unhappily, they now appear to be falling back, and after a fitful gleam of light, to be on the point of being engulphed in darkness. We have kept our readers advised of the fierce and fiery denunciations and threats which were immediately issued from the throne, constructed of human skulls, and crushing beneath its foul and hideous mass millions of human hearts. Those threats have been but too successful. The democratic leaders are crying *pecavi*, renewing their oaths of allegiance, and doing once more most infamous homage to the great enemy of our beloved country, and of the human race. The *Swiss* of New Hampshire seem to be decidedly in the ascendant. Their patriotism is lauded as the only genuine. In both houses, they have received a kind of applause, which ought to make them ask themselves, "What wrong they have been doing?" But so far from it, they chime in and chant their own praises, making self-complacent comparisons between themselves and their neighbors of old Massachusetts! We should not be surprised if Mr. Atherton should have a statue voted him. If it should be so, we hope it will be made *with a gag in the mouth*. Mr. Beardsley, we are pleased to add, still maintains his ground, and it seems to be generally thought that he has too much character and spirit to yield it. He is the object of scarcely less animosity than Mr. Adams.

We will now redeem the pledge we gave some two months ago, either to give Mr. *John McKeon* occasion to say, "Save me from my friends, or to knock under" to him and his *abolition* friend and advocate. This matter has been thus long apparently neglected, because we could not, without paying ten dollars for the privilege, have access to a journal of Congress, until we came to the city of Washington. We are not aware that in the vast and opulent city of New-York, there is an institution where the records of the national legislature can be consulted by a poor student, except upon such onerous terms; not at any rate by the editor of an abolition paper. We offered to the Society Library to furnish our paper, a condition on which we were informed other city editors had access to that valuable collection. This was rejected, with a degree of contumely.

The offense which we were charged with committing against Mr. McKeon, is contained in the following extract of a notice we gave in the Standard, of a New-York repeal meeting:

"The Hon. John McKeon, late member of Congress, presided, and addressed the meeting in a happy manner, and with much effect. It was, in truth, a very interesting meeting. One thing, and only one, interrupted the harmony of our feelings. It was, to hear this honorable John declaim, with a bold and unblushing forehead, against the *attempt* to destroy the *right of petition* in Ireland, when he has been helping, for several years, to destroy it in America. When John Quincy Adams presented a petition for the repeal of this Union—a more corrupt and fatal one than that of England and Ireland—Mr. McKeon, with the slaveholders, did what little he could to crush the old man; and they would have done it, if he had not proved a giant, and tossed the Lilliputians right and left. Mr. McKeon voted faithfully for the congressional gag, as often as he was bid.

If it were possible for a correct man to survive the loss of humanity and political rectitude, Mr. McKeon would shrink from making a display of himself, (or rather *not* of himself,) on such an occasion. What can be more offensive, we will not say to just moral sentiment, but even to good taste, than that gross and shameless inconsistency—that jarring incongruity, which every one feels, when a man clamorously demands for a distant people, and from a foreign government, professing which he is ruthlessly and tyrannously trampling down at home? 'None but a good man can be an orator.'"

The following was the plea put in by Mr. McKeon's political friend:

The Standard of November 16th, contains an editorial article commenting on a speech made at a repeal meeting, by John McKeon, late a *democratic* member of Congress, from the city of New-York. The article, in addition to other bitter revilings of John McKeon, such as were never bestowed in the Standard on any *whig*, contains the following, viz:

"One thing, and only one, interrupted the harmony of our feelings. It was to hear this honorable John, declaim, with a bold and unblushing forehead, against the attempt to destroy the right of petition in Ireland, when he has been helping, for several years, to destroy it in America! When John Quincy Adams presented a petition for the repeal of our Union, &c. Mr. McKeon, with the slaveholders, did what little he could to crush the old man, &c. &c. Mr. McKeon voted *faithfully* for the congressional gag, as often as he was bid."

The above clearly implies that Mr. McKeon voted constantly against Mr. Adams and his friends, on the occasion referred to. I have examined the journals, and do not find that he gave a single vote of the kind.

It implies also, that he frequently and faithfully voted for the congressional gag, *for several years*, and that most, if not all his votes on the subject, were for the gag. This is so far from true, that I cannot find, in the journals, a single vote of his in favor of the gag, though I find two against it, and one against the resolution to censure Mr. Giddings.

And as to his laboring *several years* against a right of petition, he was in Congress but two years, in all, if I am rightly informed.

Instead of such severe censures, Mr. McKeon is deserving of some commendation, which I doubt not he would have received, had he been a whig.

I will now notice a fact, in relation to your article on politics, of November 2. In that article you assert that a democratic legislature passed the black law of Ohio, and leave it to be inferred that it is still in force. I am informed by an abolitionist from that State, in whose knowledge and veracity I place entire confidence, that it was a *whig* legislature which passed the law, and that a democratic legislature has repealed it. The facts, therefore, were precisely the reverse of what your article intimated. Yours, &c. E.

It appears that the writer had examined the journals; we had not done so, but stated from general recollection of the proceedings of Congress, what we believed to be substantially true. We have now examined the journals, and find the following to be the state of the record:

June 7th. On Mr. Adams's amendment, excepting the "21st rule" from the rules and orders to be adopted by the House, Mr. McKeon voted *yea*.

It then became the object of the friends of the gag to prevent definitive action in the then state of the House. Mr. *Wise* moved to lay the subject on the table, but Mr. J. G. Floyd, of New-York, moved to *adjourn*; on which motion Mr. McKeon voted *yea*; Mr. Adams and his friends *nay*; and the motion was lost. Mr. *Fillmore*, of New-York, moved the previous question, and Mr. *Chapman*, of Alabama, moved to adjourn, which was again negatived, Mr. McKeon again voting *yea*, and Mr. Adams *nay*. The question on agreeing to the resolution as amended, was then taken, and Mr. McKeon voted with Mr. Adams, in the affirmative.

June 9th. Mr. *Charles J. Ingersoll*, of Pennsylvania, having moved, on a former day, to reconsider the vote whereby the "21st rule" was excepted from the rule and orders, and that motion being now before the House, a motion was made by Mr. *Wise* to adjourn, which was carried, Mr. McKeon voting *yea*, Mr. Adams *nay*.

June 10th. Mr. *Randolph*, of New Jersey, moved that Mr. Ingersoll's motion do lie on the table, equivalent to a rejection. This was negatived, Mr. Adams voting *yea*, Mr. McKeon *nay*. The previous question was then called, Mr. Adams voting for it, and Mr. McKeon against it. On the main question upon Ingersoll's motion, Mr. McKeon voted with Mr. Adams, in the negative, and it was lost. Mr. *Fornance*, of Pennsylvania, then moved to reconsider the resolution, whereby the rules, as amended by Mr. Adams, were adopted.

June 14th. The motion of Mr. Fornance was taken up, and on the question, will the House reconsider their vote adopting the rules and orders *without the* 21*st*, the vote was, *yeas* 106, *nays* 104. *Mr. McKeon voted yea.* Had he voted nay, it would have made a *tie;* and Mr. White, the speaker, judging from his whole conduct since, would have given his casting vote against the gag; in which case, the rules as amended by Mr. Adams, could not have been rescinded or altered during the rest of the session, without a majority of two-thirds. We have said the above concerning Mr. White, because it is most just that the meed of praise should be awarded by every lover of justice and of his country, to that upright and high-minded individual. We believe that if ever a man anxiously sought to do his duty in the chair, it was John White, of Kentucky. Had he been capable of prostituting his high office to the service of injustice, oppression, and chicanery, he might have been in power now, as probably in some way he will sooner or later be again. During two sessions, he was armed with power to receive or reject our petitions. He gave every one of them the destination desired by the petitioners. In no instance did he avail himself of the arbitrary power conferred upon him. Can it be doubted that he would have done generally by his casting vote precisely what he did every day during the two sessions, in the multitude of particular cases submitted to his disposal? Again, during the present session, he alone of all the southern delegations, has stood up firmly for the right, unyielding to the pressure of all around him, and fearless of the risk at home. No man can look upon the countenance of Mr. White, without seeing that it is irradiated with the spirit of a just and ingenuous man.

At the second session of the twenty-seventh Congress, viz: 1841–2, Mr. McKeon's name does not appear on any of the votes touching the "21st rule," nor in any vote relating to the impeachment of Mr. Adams. He therefore dodged these questions, or was absent from Washington. The presumption is, that he was at his post. If it was the former, we submit to his advocate whether it helps his case. In fact, that advocate does virtually admit that Mr. McKeon meanly evaded every vote by *yeas* and *nays*, which was taken during the proceedings against Mr. Adams. We cheerfully admit that it was not correct, (in the sense we meant,) that Mr. McKeon did what he could to crush Mr. Adams, in his great conflict with the powers of slavery. He did something to that end, but not all that he might. He did not strike at him, but he deserted him.

December 6, 1842, third session of the twenty-seventh Congress, Mr. Adams moved to rescind the gag rule. Mr. Weller moved to lay the resolution on the table—*yeas* 85, *nays* 93. Mr. McKeon voted *nay*, with Mr. Adams and his friends. The previous question was then called, and upon that Mr. McKeon voted *nay*, with Atherton, Wise, Clifford, Pickens, Rhett, Snyder, Weller, Wood, &c. The effect of this vote was to arrest all action for the day, and postpone the whole subject to the following day. Mr. Adams and his friends voted in favor of the previous question, i. e. for coming at the main question *now*. The reason of this discrepancy in the votes was, that twelve of the democratic members gave one vote to hoodwink their constituents, and another to help the slaveholders, and not forfeit their claim to a share of the loaves and fishes.

December 7. The motion to lay Mr. Adams's motion on the table, was again made, and again lost, Mr. McKeon voting against it. But the previous question being called, Mr. McKeon voted against it, and against Mr. Adams and his friends. This last vote was 91 to 93; so that if Mr. McKeon had voted consistently, he would again have made a tie, and probably have changed the result.

December 8. The same game was repeated, Mr. McKeon voting against laying on the table, and then voting against doing anything else.

December 12. Between this and December 7, no less than *twenty-seven* additional members had arrived from the South, and *fifteen* of them on this morning. The time had therefore come for giving the *coup de grace* to the right of petition, for the remainder of the twenty-seventh Congress. Mr. McKeon, and some other northern democrats who were fearful of their constituents, yet fond of fish, were afraid to give that blow themselves; so they held the victim until the executioners came! This was adding hypocrisy to pro-slavery. Those who played the same double part as Mr McKeon, in the abovementioned proceedings, were from

MAINE—Littlefield, Lowell, Alfred, Marshall.

MASSACHUSETTS—*Cushing.*

NEW-YORK—Brewster, R. D. Davis, Ferris, J.G. Floyd, Gordon, R. McClellan, McKeon, Roosevelt.

PENNSYLVANIA—*W. W. Irvin.*

Upon this evidence, we submit it to abolitionists, and all others who may honor our labors with their attention, whether the charge which we made against Mr. McKeon, of gross inconsistency in denouncing the British government for attempting, as he said, to suppress the right of petition in Ireland, is not maintained; whether it was not our duty to make it; and whether party spirit has not got the better of his abolitionism, who goes deliberately to work to pick from the journals of Congress particular votes of an equivocal nature, and attempt to palm them off, contrary to the truth of the case, as constituting the general character and tenor of a man's legislative course? We have never busied ourselves with setting up tests of abolition orthodoxy. We have long been of opinion that if abolitionists would occupy themselves less in disputing about who is entitled to the name, and more in doing the works suitable to the character, our cause would get on a great deal better than it does. But if any circumstances can justify us in questioning the sincerity of abolition professions, it is when the party making them, defends those whom it is his duty as an abolitionist to denounce, and denounces those whom it is his duty to aid; when he lauds the guilty, for the sake of convicting the innocent!

In regard to the authors of the Ohio "black act," so-called, we have no recollection of having said anything about them, in the essay on the "Politics of Anti-Slavery." But if we had said what our correspondent charges, we could defend ourself, and carry the war into Africa. He is entirely mistaken as to the political character of the legislature which passed that act. It was a *democratic* legislature, and nearly every democratic member voted *for*, and more than two-thirds of the whigs *against* it! We state this on the authority of both whig and democratic members from that State, in the present Congress. We suspect our correspondent made his accusation on "new organization" authority. He has labored very faithfully to give effect to their false and foul charges of treachery to the anti-slavery cause.

ESSAYS ON THE PUNISHMENT OF DEATH.

By Charles Spear, author of "Tittles of Jesus," Essays on Imprisonment for Debt, &c. (1 *vol.* 12 *mo. pp.* 237.) *Boston, published by the Author.*

We would that we could induce every one of our subscribers to buy this book. It is the clearest and most condensed array of facts and arguments, on the subject of Capital Punishment, that we ever met with. Portions of it are thrilling in the extreme. We do not envy the head or the heart of the man, who can rise from its perusal without an utter abhorrence of this bloody relic of barbarism, and a determination to do his utmost to sweep it from our criminal code with or without *benefit of clergy*. The author is a poor man, well known for his philanthropic efforts, and love of the human race. He has printed it at his own expense. Buy the book and lend it far and wide. It will scatter good seed, and yield a noble harvest. For sale at our office, 143 Nassau street.

☞ Jonathan Palmer departed this life on the 20th instant, at his residence, in Fallington, Bucks county Pennsylvania, in the eighty-first year of his age. He was a most kind-hearted and conscientious man, greatly beloved and respected by relatives and friends. He was much interested in the anti-slavery cause, and warmly sympathized with those who were laboring for ren in bondage. The week previous to his death, he was active in spreading notices of a meeting for Lucretia Mott, in the village where he lived; a service he was always ready to perform. Few persons had less to reproach themselves with than this Friend. The governing principle of his life, in small things as well as great, seemed to be, to do unto others as he would wish them to do to him. He was a very intelligent man, and a great reader. His memory was very tenacious. He knew Homer's Iliad from beginning to end.

He was a direct descendant of the first settlers of Pennsylvania. The land on which they settled still remains in his family; and the remains of the cave where they first found shelter, may still be seen.—I. T. H.

HYDROPATHY, OR THE WATER CURE.

This is the title of a volume lately published by Wiley & Putnam, Broadway. It is chiefly compiled from the most eminent English authors on the subject, by Joel Shew, M. D. It gives a very complete view of the principles of Hydropathy, and of the modes of treatment in almost every variety of disease. Those who wish to understand how to apply the Water Cure judiciously and successfully, will do well to buy this book. The subject is an important one, and deserves attention. The number of converts to this theory increase daily, both in this country and in Europe; and among them are numbered many scientific and reflecting men. "Regular practitioners" are adopting it more and more into their own practice. An abridgment of Claridge's book on this subject passed through eighteen editions in as many months. This theory may of course be abused by the ignorant. So much the more need to buy this book, and understand the scientific principles.

Anti-Slavery Items.

FLIGHT OF A SLAVE.—An escaped slave from Louisiana, arrived in this town last week, having traveled on foot the entire distance. A companion who started with him, died of fatigue and exhaustion before they got as far as Baltimore. They traveled through the woods and by retired ways, and suffered much from the laceration of their feet. The one who reached the town was very shy, and would not trust himself in any kind of vehicle, even with those who were disposed to give them assistance. Nor would he go into a store to obtain something to eat. He was directed to the house of one of our clergymen, who kindly gave him some food, and assisted him on his way. He is probably now out of the reach of his owner, who, he says, was once a member of Congress.—*Bunkerhill Aurora.*

CASSIUS M. CLAY.—Barritt's Christ

with extreme regret and disapprobation we have seen respectable people of the town of Concord joining with the members of the pro-slavery Church here, in nominating Henry Clay, a conspicuous and notorious SLAVEHOLDER, to the highest gift in the estimation of the people.

Congress.

SENATE, Monday, Feb. 5.

Mr. Hannegan, of Georgia, presented the following joint resolution from the State of Indiana, on the subject of the Oregon territory:

Whereas the district of country known as the territory of Oregon rightfully belongs to our national government; and whereas the insatiate avarice and grasping spirit of the British government seems already directed to its subjugation and conversion; and whereas the slightest infringement of national right is a prelude to more high-handed and audacious aggressions; therefore,

Be it resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and representatives requested, to use their proper instrumentality to provide for the immediate occupation, organization, and defense of Oregon territory, "peaceably if we can, forcibly, if we must."

Mr. H. said he was happy to say that the resolution had passed with singular unanimity, both branches of the legislature having adopted it without a dissenting voice. At a proper time he would take an opportunity to address the Senate on this subject, and would now content himself with simply moving that the resolution be laid on the table and be printed; which motion was agreed to.

Mr. Evans, of Maine, presented a petition from merchants of Portland, asking a drawback on molasses, and intimated his dissent from the object.

[This is to aid the *distillers*.]

Two petitions were presented, asking a reduction of postage.

Mr. *Jarnegan*, of Tennessee, from the committee on revolutionary claims, reported against the memorial of the son and heir of the *Count de Grasse*. Mr. J. said there was no claim. The report was laid on the table.

Mr. Evans, of Maine, spoke *on the tariff*, in reply to Mr. McDuffie. He referred to the history of the country, to show that the protective policy had always been attended by the most favorable results. When the revenue and the public credit had fallen—when it was necessary to resort to loans in time of peace—when commerce and navigation were at a stand—when real estate was sinking, wise men saw the necessity of arresting a course of events that was leading the country to ruin, by the adoption of this policy. The country continued prosperous till the compromise act reduced duties to their lowest point. When duties were at the lowest point, that was the time of the greatest depression of the business interests of the country, and of the prices of cotton; and then we had again to resort to loans for carrying on the ordinary operations of the government. He might go back to 1789, and show that the same causes had, in like manner, never failed to produce the same effects. The consequences of low duties had always proved to be disastrous. There was not a time in our history when low duties were not followed by injury to commerce and the revenue; nor when the reverse was not followed by prosperity and increased energy and activity in all branches of business.

He cited a passage from Adam Smith, showing that no nation could prosper, or had prospered, without a diversity of interests—without commerce, manufactures, and agriculture. No nation could attain to great eminence even by commerce alone. Venice, the greatest commercial State in the world at one time, had no agriculture, and but few manufactures; and it declined till it became one of the least considerable States of Europe. The same was the case with Holland. But as to England, vast as is her commerce, and extensive as are her manufactures, they are both of secondary importance to her agriculture.

Before Mr. E. had concluded, the Senate adjourned.

FEBRUARY 6.

Mr. Tappan, of Ohio, presented resolutions of the legislature of Ohio, for reducing salaries and compensations of all officers of the United States, at least 33 1-3 per cent. Referred to committee on retrenchment, and to be printed.

Mr. White, of Indiana, presented resolutions from the legislature of that State, in favor of the reduction of postage, and for allowing the name of the person sending a newspaper or pamphlet by mail to endorse his or her name on it.

Mr. King, of Alabama, presented a petition from citizens of Alexandria, (town and county,) asking that there may be no legislative action on certain petitions sent to the national legislature until Congress shall be satisfied that they are for the benefit of the people at large.

[This is a rather mysterious way of stating the contents of a petition.]

The subject of a grant of $5000 a year to the insane asylum of the District was discussed. It was stated that a disproportionate number of lunatics assemble at the seat of government. The subject was postponed.

Mr. Evans of Maine, replied further to Mr. McDuffie's calculations about the effect of a dissolution of the Union.

The southern confederacy was to be united at home, and enjoy perpetual peace abroad. There was to be no envy, no rivalry, no jealousy springing from human passions, and its commerce was never to be interrupted, nor its peace disturbed. They were to have a commerce with England, and sell to her all their products. Their exports would amount to one hundred millions, and their imports, including twenty millions in profits, to one hundred and twenty millions. All these imports were to be consumed at home, or sold to the Western confederacy; for without the Western confederacy, the glorious nation of the South could not get along one hour. They must rely on the West for supplies. Why not take her at once into the confederacy with the South? That would not do, because it would destroy the homogeneousness of their interests, and, after some years, the same questions would spring up between the South and the West as agitate us now. The South was to export cotton and rice, and import one hundred millions, besides the profits. Where were the profits to come from? From commerce. The profits were derived from the importation of the goods into the country, and belonged to those who had the trade and the navigation in their hands. Where else could they go? The New England ships could not be employed in the trade, for that would destroy the homogeneousness of the scheme, and the profits would enable New England to import and consume foreign articles. The trade and the profits on it must go, therefore, to foreign nations. The commerce would be carried on with England, and the profits would go to her.

The one hundred and twenty millions of foreign imports were to be consumed. The whole population of the Southern confederacy would be only about five or six millions. The population of the whole country is about seventeen or eighteen millions, and we find an importation of a hundred or a hundred and twenty millions adequate for the consumption of all. Could a population of six millions consume a hundred millions of imported articles? It was what no nation ever did before, and never would do, except in fancy. What were the imports made up of? One-half of them were fancy articles. The mild climate of the South, and the habits of a large portion of her people, rendered many of these fancy articles unnecessary to them. He did not mean to say that the South would not, or did not now, consume as large a portion of the luxuries imported, or a larger portion, than any other part of the country; but many of her people are of a class that never use them at all. A large amount, too, of the imports consisted of silks, linens, glass, &c. of which a portion of the population were not consumers. The Senator supposed that the Southern confederacy would consume this vast amount of imports. It was utterly impossible. Look at it for a moment. It was a large part of the whole amount of the manufactures of Great Britain. The population of Great Britain was twenty-six millions—more than four times the amount of the population of the supposed southern confederacy—and the amount of consumption proposed, vastly exceeded the consumption of Great Britain herself, in proportion to her population, though there was there, mingled with some poverty, so much wealth and extravagance. It was a greater amount of consumption than any nation was equal to, in proportion to relative population.

What portion, then, of these imports are to go to the West? The honorable Senator indicated to the West the prospect of free trade, low duties, and low prices. What will the West buy these imports with? She must pay for them. What will the South take of the West? She wants nothing but the live stock of the West, for she raises her own grain. She cannot take Kentucky bagging, for that would destroy the whole theory of homogeneous interests, and revive a home manufacture. All the cotton bagging must come from Glasgow and Dundee, lest the West should become a manufacturing nation. The South will take none of the western hemp and wool, of which she will be so great a producer. She will take nothing from her but live stock.

But the West was to find, through the southern ports—how they were to get there he did not know—an opportunity to export their commodities. But that, again, would break up the scheme; because, if the West went to exporting, they would also commence importing, and supply themselves with all their foreign articles of consumption, instead of buying from the South. If the West have their own exports, they will also have their own imports. Where would be the glorious prosperity of the South and all the magnificent results that were promised by the homogeneous confederacy? Were the countless millions who were to people the West to contentthemselves with a trifling trade with the South, and selling them a little live stock? What else could they do? If they began manufacturing it would break up the theory. By manufacturing, the West would become sellers instead of buyers. The West was, beyond doubt, destined to be a great manufacturing country, for it was the most profitable mode in which they could apply their labor. It would be a great wool-growing country, and the only mode in which the wool could be used was to manufacture it. It could not be sold, because wool was cheaply produced, and in large quantities, in various portions of the world. The great danger now was, that wool would be imported so cheap as to break down the home production of it. The West must manufacture her wool, and she will have no occasion to buy woolens from abroad, but will rather seek a market for her manufactures at home. There was danger, then, of collisions between the Southern confederacy and the West?

Mr. E. then showed that the same economeial questions would arise betwixt Virginia and the Southwest, and South Carolina and the Southwest, which now exist between the North and South. In regard to abolition, he made the following remarks, which show a heartlessness and a recreancy to liberty, truth, and justice. It is outrageous to call the simple discussion of slavery, and petitioning for its removal, with the jurisdiction of Congress, "aggression!" It is wanton and treacherous to utter such sentiments, at this crisis of our struggle to restore the right of petition after it has been insolently trampled upon for ten years. Such a course bespeaks a "Northern man with Southern principles."

The South would find, after all, that the great security of her institutions was in the Union and the Constitution. If the Union was dissolved, would the spirit of fanaticism in the North be quelled, or would it become aggravated and unrestrained? Where would be the law for the recovery of fugitive slaves? Would not aggression on the great interests of the South increase, and would it not take the form of direct interference, whereas now the great body of the people of the North are restrained by constitutional guaranties from affording any countenance to these aggressions?

What could be expected from Great Britain? Would she, all at once, drop her professed hostility to domestic slavery?

In conclusion, Mr. E. read several passages in Washington's farewell address.

[When Washington prepared that address, he did not expect slavery to continue in the United States. What is the Union to us, if we are treated as "aggressors," for exercising one of the dearest rights it was intended to secure? Mr. E. is a man of too much sense, if not principle, not to be ashamed, yet, of such a sentiment.]

FEBRUARY 7.

Mr. Berrien, of Georgia, presented a resolution of the legislature of Georgia in relation to the resolution of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts on the subject of apportioning representation and direct taxation among the several States according to their respective free population, &c.

The resolution is a report of the committee on the state of the republic, and says:

"Your committee dissent wholly with Massachusetts in regard to the proposed amendment, and ask the unanimous adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the Constitution of the United States was the result of mutual concession and compromise among the several States; that the federal basis as established by that instrument was a concession to the slaveholding States of this Union; and that any attempt now to strike from the instrument that feature, would be a gross violation of the faith pledged on its adoption."

Mr. Berrien said, as the resulutions of the legislature of Massachusetts were laid on the table, he would move that these be laid on the table and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. Buchanan presented a remonstrance from citizens of Bakersville, Alleghany county, remonstrating against the annexation of Texas.

FEBRUARY 8.

After the reading of the journal, Mr. *Bates*, of Massachusetts rose and said: "Mr. President, some days since, I presented to the Senate resolves of the legislature of Massachusetts upon the subject of amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to apportion representation and direct taxation among the States according to the free population in each. I did it because, as a Senator from Massachusetts, I thought it my duty to do it. I moved to lay them on the table. There was not, within my contemplation, more than one event that could happen that would induce me to call them up. I am not for disturbing the foundations of this government. I also, as usual in such cases, moved that they be printed. The Senate refused to print them. It is now too late to move a reconsideration of that vote, and I would not move it if I could.

Yesterday the Honorable Senator from Georgia, (*Mr. Berrien,*) presented counter resolutions of the legislature of his State, upon the same subject. He moved to lay them upon the table, and to print them. The Senate directed them to be printed. I voted for the printing.

I rise now, Mr. President, to bring this fact distinctly and formally to the notice of the Senate, that the Senate may, if it think proper, correct this difference; or if not, that my State may see the discrimination that has been made, and the measures of justice or injustice that has been meted out to her. Mr. President, I have no motion to submit to the Senate. I rose only to submit these remarks to its consideration.

The tariff was discussed by Mr. Woodbury, of New Hampshire, in opposition.

FEBRUARY 9.

Mr. Dayton, of New Jersey, presented resolutions of the legislature of New Jersey, instructing him to vote for refunding General Jackson's fine. He declared his intention not to obey said instructions, and assigned his reasons.

The Senate passed a bill to appropriate $100 for the support of lunatics in the District of Columbia.

FEBRUARY 12.

Mr. Fairfield, of Maine, presented resolutions of the legislature of Maine, in favor of the allowance of claims for *French spoliations*.

Mr. Fairfield urged the justice and equity of this claim, and its increased obligation by reason of the delay of justice. Referred to the committee on foreign relations. *Mr. Huntington*, of Connecticut, spoke in support of the tariff.

FEBRUARY 13.

The bill for refunding General Jackson's fine, was taken up, and an amendment reported by the judiciary committee, intended to preclude any possible inference unfavorable to Judge Hall, was rejected, *yeas* 16, *nays* 26. The debate on the tariff was continued by Mr. Huntington, of Connecticut, in favor.

Mr. Miller, of New Jersey, stated his reasons for disobeying instructions from the legislature of his State, in regard to General Jackson's fine.

FEBRUARY 14.

The Jackson fine bill was again taken up, and Messrs. Woodbridge and Porter, of Michigan, expressed their dissent from the doctrine of instructions to Senators by State legislatures, stating that they had received instructions. The bill was passed, *yeas* 30, *nays* 16.

FEBRUARY 15.

A bill for repairing and paving Pennsylvania Avenue, and appropriating $40,000 for that purpose, was passed.

FEBRUARY 16.

Mr. Phelps, of Vermont, addressed the Senate in favor of the tariff. He stated, among other facts, that Massachusetts used as much flour for starch for sizing, as was taken of us by Great Britain, for all purposes.

FEBRUARY 19.

The *President* of the Senate presented a petition from John F. H. Claiborne, one of the commissioners for examining claims under the treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, representing the gross frauds practised upon the ignorant Indians by speculators; and asking the intervention of Congress to stop these frauds, and to do justice to the Indians.

Mr. *Sturgeon*, of Pennsylvania, presented two memorials, one signed by ladies altogether, and the other indiscriminately by both sexes, for the repeal of all laws which sanction slavery in any way. Motion to *receive* ordered to lie on the table.

[It is surprising that not one Senator ventures yet to raise his voice in favor of the right of petition, violated in this mean and *evasive* manner. We do trust that old Massachusetts will supply the vacancy expected soon to occur, by electing a man, who will dare, and feel it his duty, to represent the sentiments so often expressed by the legislature, and people of the State.]

A debate of some length took place on a bill to buy a book of Robert Greenhow, a clerk in the department of State, on the history of *California*, and other territories of the west and northwest coast of North America.

[It is difficult to see what right Congress have to buy books about California, any more than Upshur had to order our squadron, under *Jones*, to survey the coasts and harbors thereof. The works was represented in the debate to contain Spanish documents, translated by Mr. Greenhow. Now there are in the executive documents communicated at different times to Congress, great and mischievous errors in the translations of Spanish by this officer. In translating the Amistad documents, he rendered the word *ladinas*, (which, if truly translated, would have shown that the Havana custom house papers in the case, were procured by fraud,) by the English word "sound," which has not the remotest resemblance to the meaning, but which effaced the feature that would show the frauds. Mr. Adams exposed this at the time. This kind of blunder or abuse, has continued ever since.]

Mr. *Benton* said we had enough, formerly, of this buying of books for members of Congress, and it was quite time that it was done with. He was surprised at a proposition of this sort, after what the Senate had done heretofore on the subject. The Senate had, more than once, refused to continue this monstrous abuse. Now, it was proposed to buy these books of Mr. Greenhow, and distribute them among the members. Next year, it would be found necessary to give all the new books, that their predecessors had obtained, and thus the abuse would be perpetuated. Fifty thousand dollars a year, and a hundred thousand dollars a year, had been the yearly appropriation to bring up the level of the members of Congress with their predecessors in regard to the supply of books. The system commenced as far back as 1822, and any book once ordered, was ordered at every Congress, to place its members on a level with those who preceded them. It was one of the most enormous, and the most scandalous abuses that ever crept into the government. It had grown up during the last twenty years, and would increase yearly unless the Senate maintained their ground and put a stop to it. Our eyes were first opened to the extent and enormity of the abuse by a Senator from Georgia, (Mr. King,) about ten years ago. It then appeared that Mr. Templeman was purchasing for ten dollars the chance of members of Congress for their right to the publication of Messrs. Clarke & Force, which work was, according to the contract, to cost half a million, and which was going on at this time. He trusted that the feelings of the whole Senate would revolt at this abuse, and that they would refuse to take up such a proposition. He hoped they would refuse to touch it. Several Senators had refused to take any of these books. For himself, he would say that he had refused to take them, and so had the Senator from Alabama, (Mr. King.) What was the proposition here? To give a clerk fifteen hundred dollars a year for copying extracts from books, and then pay him for the work. It was unusual with him to say anything on a bill at its introduction, but he would give notice as to this bill, that he would fight it, and fight it, as long as it was before the Senate. He would have nothing to do with it, and he would fight it inch by inch; and he would be supported by many members on the right and on the left.

Messrs. *Archer* and *Buchanan* spoke in favor of the bill, but no question was taken.

Mr. Phelps of Vermont, resumed his speech on the tariff. He stated that the quantity of wheat grown in the United States was 100,000,000 bushels; 60,000,000 of which was necessary for home consumption; that Great Britain took but 5,000,000, of the surplus 40,000,000, that she had taken no more when our duties were low; and he argued that the foreign market, whatever might be our tariff, would be limited by the policy of other governments, and the competition of other grain-growing countries. Massachusetts took as much of the grain of other States, as the whole foreign market.

In reply to Mr. *Woodbury*, of New Hampshire, as to the tax paid in the shape of duties by the people of that State, on iron, he said that the duty did not operate as a tax on the consumer; for example, the duty on nails was three cents a pound; and the price among the mountains was 3 1-2 cents. Thus, by the reasoning of the gentleman, the price of the nails was but 1-2 a cent a pound! The price used to be 8 or 10 cents. The same effect on prices occurred in the case of every home manufacture. As to the article of salt, selected by Mr. McDuffie, to show the enormous burden of the tariff, he, (Mr. P.) used for his family, and a large stock of cattle and sheep, four bushels a year, the duty upon which was 32 cents, a poor man would pay a tax on his salt of 2 cents a year.

[There cannot be a more proper object of taxation than salt, if taxes are raised upon consumption. The elements of taxation in such cases, are steadiness and universality in the use of the object. The southerners have been trying for twenty years and more to exempt salt from duties. Why? Because it is an article which the slaves must have for their hoecake, and it is almost the only thing they are allowed to have which is taxed.]

If the government was to be destroyed unless this system were abandoned, let it be destroyed. Let it come, if it must come in that way. He would repeat that he had no fears of this result. It was one of the phantoms conjured up by the opponents of this policy. It had been supposed by some of the gentlemen from the South that the Union would be endangered by the abolition excitement. But there was no ground for that apprehension. Should that question ever be made to press upon the integrity of the Union, not one in five hundred of those who had countenanced it would lift a hand in hostility to the interests of the Union.

[Not just now, perhaps, but we have lately been present in very large, intelligent, and mixed assemblies, where the doctrine of *dissolution* was received gladly. We fully believe that if slavery be not abolished, the Union will not continue ten years. We fully believe that if it shall be once settled that our petitions are to continue to be spurned, slavery remain in the ascendant, and not be made, and that at an early day, the subject of solemn deliberation and remedial legislation, a tempest will be let loose upon the Union, which will sweep it like chaff, as chaff it is to those that will not bow to the slavewing.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Monday, Feb. 6.

Mr. Levy, delegate of Florida, again attempted to offer his resolution giving notice to the British government, that we wish to annul the 10th article of the Ashburton treaty. The House refused to suspend the rules for that purpose.

Mr. Beardsley had heretofore presented a petition from citizens of Oneida county, New-York, for the repeal of the law of 1793, for restoring fugitive slaves. The question was on Mr. *Weller's* motion to lay the question of reception on the table.

Mr. Beardsley desired the speaker to explain whether the effect of the motion to lay the question of reception on the table, should that motion prevail, would be to refuse to receive the petition or not?

The *Speaker*.—If the motion to lay the question of reception on the table should prevail, the petition is *not* received.

The question of laying the question of reception on the table, was then taken, and resulted as follows: Whigs are in *italics*, Northern democrats voting in favor of the right of petition, in SMALL CAPITALS. Other democrats in roman. Southern whigs voting in favor of freedom or the right of petition, in CAPS. These distinctions will be made in all future analysis of votes without further explanation.

YEAS.

Maine.—None.
New Hampshire.—E. Burke, Norris, Reding.
Massachusetts.—None.
Rhode Island.—None.
Connecticut.—John Stewart, Thomas H. Seymour.
Vermont.—None.
New-York.—Murphy, Maclay, Leonard, Clinton, Russell, Strong, P. King, Rathburn.
New Jersey.—Elmer, Farlee.
Pennsylvania.—J. T. Smith, C. J. Ingersol, Yost, Ritter, Bidlack, J. Black.
Ohio.—Duncan, Weller, E. D. Potter, McDowell, Moore, Matthews, McCauslen, St. John.
Indiana.—T. Smith, W. J. Brown, J. W. Davis, A Kennedy.
Illinois.—R. Smith, McClernard, Ficklin, Douglass.
Michigan.—None.
Delaware.—None.
Maryland, not represented.
Virginia.—Atkinson, Dromgoole, Coles, Hubard, Gilmer, *Chilton*, Lucas, Taylor, A. A. Chapman, Hopkins, Steenrod.
North Carolina.—*Clingman*, *Barringer*, D. S. Reid, *Deberry*, Saunders, Daniel.
South Carolina.—J. A. Black, Simpson, Burt, Woodward, Campbell.
Georgia.—*Stephens*, Haralson, *Chappell*, Lumpkin, Cobb, Stiles.
Kentucky.—*Grider*, Caldwell, Stone, *Thomasson*, *G. Davis*, French, Tibbatts.
Tennessee.—A. Johnson, Blackwell, Cullom, Jones, *Peyton*, Cave Johnson, *M. Brown*.
Louisiana.—Slidell, Labranche, Bassier.
Alabama.—*Dellet*, Belser, Lewis, Payne, Houston, R. Chapman, McConnell.
Mississippi.—Thompson, Hammett, Tucker.
Missouri.—Bower, Bowlin, Hughes, Relfe.

NAYS.

Maine.—HERRICK, DUNLOP, *Morse*, *Severance*, HAMLIN.
New Hampshire.—HALE.
Massachusetts.—*Adams*, *Baker*, *Grinnell*, *Hudson*, *D. P. King*, *Rockwell*, WILLIAMS, *Winthrop*.
Rhode Island.—*Cranston*, *E. R. Potter*.
Connecticut.—CATLIN.
Vermont.—*Collamer*, DILLINGHAM, *Marsh*.
New-York.—*Barnard*, BEARDSLEY, BENTON, *Carroll*, DANA, R. D. DAVIS, *Fish*, *W. Hunt*, *Moseley*, *Patterson*, PURDY, ROBINSON, *Rogers*, D. L. SEYMOUR, *A. Smith*, STETSON, *Tyler*,, WHEATON.
New Jersey.—KIRKPATRICK, SYKES.
Pennsylvania.—BRODHEAD, *J. Brown*, *Buffington*, *Dickey*, *Frick*, *J. R Ingersoll*, *Irvin*, *Jenks*, *McIlvaine*, *E. J. Morris*, *Nes*, *Ramsey*, *C. M. Reed*.
Ohio —*Florence*, *Giddings*, *Harper*, *P. B. Johnson*, *Schenk*, *Tilden*, *Vance*, *Vanmeter*, *Vinton*.
Indiana.—HENLEY, *Sample*, *C. B. Smith*.
Illinois.—*Hardin*.
Michigan.—J. B. HUNT, MCCLELLAND.
Delaware.—None.
Maryland.—Not represented.
Virginia.—None.
North Carolina.—None.
South Carolina.—None.
Georgia.—None.
Kentucky.—WHITE.
Tennessee.—None.
Louisiana.—None.
Alabama.—None.
Mississippi.—None.
Missouri.—None.

RECAPITULATION.

Yeas.—Northern democrats 37; Southern democrats 47; Southern whigs 12.—Total 96.

Nays.—Northern whigs 46; Northern democrats 22; Southern whigs 1.—Total 69.

So the question of reception was laid on the table, and the petitioners denied a hearing.

Massachusetts Resolutions.

Mr. Adams desired to present the joint resolutions of the present legislature of Massachusetts, of the same import (with a slight alteration) as those already referred to a select committee.

[These were the same resolutions which had been committed to a select committee, December 22d, by a vote of about two to one, on which occasion Mr. Adams obtained his memorable triumph, or what was supposed to be such. The reason why they were presented again, was that in engrossing them, the clerk had changed a word, and the resolutions were passed with this error. They had now been passed again, correctly engrossed; and the object of Mr. Adams was to get them in the corrected form before the committee, already charged with the consideration of them in their incorrect form.]

Mr. Burt, of South Carolina, rose and objected to the reception of the resolutions, and expressed his desire to debate that question.

Mr. Adams said that the reference of these resolutions was necessary, in order to enable the committee to make their report. And he requested the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Burt) to give reasons why resolutions adopted unanimously by the legislature of Massachusetts, should thus be treated with the indignity of a refusal to receive them.

The *Speaker*. The subject would not be debatable at this time.

Mr. Cave Johnson, of Tenn. suggested to Mr. Burt, that resolutions of the same import had already been referred to a select committee, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) was chairman. It was desirable that these resolutions should also be permitted to go there, with a view to a speedy report.

Mr. Burt. I understand that that select committee was raised in courtesy to the State of Massachusetts for a special purpose. I understand now that the course pursued by that committee, has been to connect it with a standing committee of this House, and to make it the receptacle of all these incendiary petitions and resolutions, which can be manufactured to order.

The *Speaker* said if debate arose the subject must, by the rules of the House, go over.

Mr. *Sample*, of Indiana, (a member of the select committee) desired to make a single remark.

Objected to in several parts of the House.

Mr. Adams said that without these resolutions the committee could not present a report to this House; and it would therefore be necessary to delay it. He hoped the yeas and nays would be taken on the question now raised.

The *Speaker* read the rule which provides that petitions shall not be debated on the day of their being presented: and joint resolutions are in the nature of memorials, or, at least, fall within that order of business.

The result of much conversation was a motion by Mr. Adams, that the rules of the House be suspended for the purpose of now considering the question of reception.

On the motion Mr. Adams, asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and, being taken, resulted as follows: *Yeas* 74; *nays* 91.

This vote did not differ essentially as to its composition from the preceding. So the corrected resolutions of the State of Massachusetts were not permitted to go with the erroneous ones!

[This was a peculiarly mean indignity to the State of Massachusetts. Cave Johnson, of Tennessee, though he made so candid a suggestion to Mr. Burt, *voted* the other way! Messrs. Chilton and Gilmer, of Virginia, Woodward, of South Carolina, Cullom, of Tennessee, and G. Davis, Thomasson, and White, of Kentucky, voted for the suspension of the rule.]

Several petitions for reduction of postage, were presented. If the public mean to have a reform in this department, they cannot send on their petitions too soon.]

FEBRUARY 6.

Mr. Hammett, of Mississippi, occupied the morning hour on the gag-rule. A sketch of his speech was given in the last Standard.

On motion of Mr. *Dromgoole*, of Virginia, the report and counter report, on the right of the twenty-one members from the four general ticket States to seats in the House, were taken out of committee of the whole.

[This proceeding is supposed to have been to prevent the discussion on the gag-rule from going on for the present, and thus keeping off action on the subject, until the members from Maryland come in.]

Mr. *Elmer*, of New Jersey, then addressed the House in support of the right of the said members to their seats, and against the validity of the law of Congress.

A number of petitions were presented for reduction of postage.

Mr. *Nes*, of Pennsylvania, presented the petition of sixty-four citizens of Petersburg, Adams county, Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of any act whatsoever by the present Congress of the United States, for the admission of Texas into the American Union.

Mr. *Hudson*, of Mississippi, presented the petition of Arad Gilbert, and one hundred and seventy-five others, and also the petition of Nathan Puffer, and sixty-seven others, of Massachusetts, praying Congress to recognize the independence of Hayti.

[Our friends should not overlook the importance of this subject. It embraces the whole abolition question, but the petitions are not excluded by the rule, nor debate thereon gagged by the rule.]

FEBRUARY 7.

Mrs. Madison came into the House and took a seat on the right of the Speaker, near the clerks desk.

The right of the members from New Hampshire, Georgia, Mississippi, and Missouri, to their seats, was debated. Messrs. Elmer, of New Jersey, Dillingham, of Vermont, and Woodward, of South Carolina, taking the affirmatiae; and Messrs. Belser, of Alabama, and M. Brown, of Tennessee, and Collamer, of Vermont, the negative. The only argument relied upon on the affirmative side, was that Congress in acting on the subject of the election of representatives, had not made a law which was complete in itself, so as to enable the electors to choose without additional legislation by the State. On the other hand, it was contended that Congress having confessedly the *whole* power over the subject, possessed every *part* of it, and might use any part, and leave the rest to the State; and a variety of cases were adduced, in which both Congress and State legislatures had acted upon this principle.

FEBRUARY 8.

Mr. C. B. Smith, of Indiana, presented the petition of sundry citizens of Randolph county, Illinois, *praying the annexation* of Texas to the United States.

Also, the petition of sundry citizens of Randolph county, Illinois, praying a modification of the naturalization laws, so as to prevent *abolitionists from becoming naturalized*.

Also, the petition of Charles W. Hunter, and one hundred and fifteen others, citizens of Madisen county, Illinois, remonstrating against the annexation of Texas to the United States.

Mr. Catlin presented the memorial of Erastus Dickinson and others, citizens of Connecticut, remonstrating against the annexation of Texas to the Union.

Also, the memorial of John Martin and others, citizens of the same State, and upon the same subject.

Also, the memorial of Jared Clark and others, citizens of the same State, and upon the same subject.

Several petitions were presented for reduction of postage. The debate on the disputed seats was continued.

FEBRUARY 9.

Debate was continued as above.

FEBRUARY 10.

Same debate continued.

FEBRUARY 12.

Mr. Clinch, of Georgia, a new member, took his seat. The debate on the disputed seats was continued. Mr. Black, of Georgia, treated the question as one of *expelling* twenty-one members of the House, and referred to cases of expulsion and censure, or attempted censure, causing to be read by the clerk the high treason resolutions of T. F. Marshall, against Mr. Adams. As this reading went on, the House grew merry, and a general laugh commenced. Mr. B. said the House had not dared even in such an atrocious case, so much as to *censure*; the honorable *member* from Massachusetts, had completely triumphed, after a pitched battle. He alluded to the censure of Mr. Giddings, from which the House had come out ingloriously. He also cited all the cases of assault and battery on the floor of the House, and then demanded whether the House, which had not dared to expel or censure in such flagrant cases, would now expel twenty-one members for no offense whatever. The House appeared to be highly diverted by this *argument*, which was evidently made with perfect innocence of any intention to make fun.

FEBRUARY 13.

The debate on the disputed seats was continued by *Mr. G. Davis*, of Kentucky; *Schenk*, of Ohio; *Barringer*, of North Carolina, and *Barnard*, of New-York, against; and by Messrs. *Stiles*, of Georgia; and *Dromgoole*, of Virginia, in favor of the right of the sitting members. They adjourned at a late hour in the evening.

FEBRUARY 14.

The previous question having been demanded upon the subject of the disputed seats, was seconded. The House proceeded to vote by yeas and nays, upon the right of each member from New Hampshire and Georgia, confirming them all, and adjourned at a late hour of the evening. The highest vote was, *yeas* 128, *nays* 68.

FEBRUARY 15.

The seats of the members from Mississippi and Missouri, were confirmed.

Mr. Levy's resolution, calling for information, touching the Florida fugitives, was adopted.

FEBRUARY 16.

Mr. Gilmer, of Virginia, made a report in behalf of himself, and another, on the Massachusetts resolutions, and the slave representation. The committee had voted that it was inexpedient to recommend the alteration proposed by Massachusetts.

The committee had also adopted a resolution authorizing any member or members of it to assign, at their own time, their reasons, in the shape of an argumentative report to the House, sustaining the conclusion to which the committee had come. Under this authority of the committee, he therefore, now asked leave of the House to report the views of a portion of the members of the committee.

The report was laid on the table to be printed with other reports on the same subject, when they shall be made.

Mr. Severance, of Maine, spoke against the "21st rule."

FEBRUARY 17.

Mr. Campbell, of South Carolina, spoke in favor of the "21st rule." His main argument was based on the precedents, which had been established on this subject by the House. He said "The 25th (formerly the 21st) rule had already had a favorable influence; for it must be evident to every gentleman upon this floor, notwithstanding what might be said of the increased abolition of the North, that the number of abolition petitions had visibly decreased. Scarcely one was offered now except by the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Ohio.

On a bill for the relief of John F. Schuyler, Mr. *Wentworth*, of Illinois, spoke of the necessity of infusing a strong military spirit into the people of the United States. He adverted to the unsettled questions of boundaries, and to the hope which he entertained that hereafter not a single rood of ground claimed by the United States, would be given up.

[This idea of moulding the people into warlike or pacific puppets, at the pleasure of their servants, is not very respectful nor very democratic! The people will be warlike enough, give them a good cause. But they must have their ears rubbed like dogs, to make them fight at the mere bidding of *keepers*.]

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

General Items.

Great Fire in China.—A most destructive fire occurred at Canton on the night of October 24th. It destroyed from 1200 to 1500 buildings, including the Danish factory, Turner's factory, part of the French factory, the ancient temple of Pak-tai-meun, dedicated to the god of the north pole, and the whole of New China street. It commenced about 7 o'clock in the evening, in some Chinese mat-houses, situated about a hundred yards to the northwest of New China street, (there being a light breeze from the southward,) and then spread in all directions, more particularly to the windward.

The fire was fortunately stopped before it reached the American factories. Considerable cotton and some tea were destroyed, but the whole of the treasure seems to have been saved. The loss of goods destroyed, belonging to the Chinese, exclusive of the value of the buildings, was estimated at $300,000.

A Real Mandarin Coming.—It is now positively stated that a Chinese ambassador, "a real live China mandarin," deputed by his celestial majesty, the imperial brother to the sun, and cousin-german to the moon, is about forthwith to exhibit his pig-tail and five-clawed dragon, his peacock feather, and his button, among the blue ribbons, black rods, white sticks, and garters, of the court of her majesty, Queen Victoria.

Sir Francis Burdett.—This gentleman, so long conspicuous in the political history of England, has recently died. The physicians proclaim that he was a victim to Hydropathy, or Water Cure; but as Lady Burdett, his wife, died a short time before, and had perseveringly refused to try the water-cure, it merely seems to prove that no system of medicine can keep people from dying, some time or other.

Mrs. Gilmour.—This young woman who was arrested the moment she arrived in this country, and sent back to Scotland, on charge of having murdered her husband, has been acquitted. The jury returned a verdict that the deceased came to his death by arsenic, but that it was not proved to have been administered by the prisoner.

Fire and Loss of Life in Nantucket.—The Poor House at Quaise, Nantucket, was entirely consumed on the night of the 20th of February. Ten of the inmates perished in the flames. There were fifty-nine persons in the house, besides the family of Captain Bunker, the keeper, who lost all his effects, and forty dollars in money. Eighteen of the paupers were bed-ridden, and one had not walked for twenty years. It is a miracle that so many escaped. The citizens assembled instantly, and almost superhuman efforts were made to save the sufferers. The fire took in the cook room.

Fire in Pawtucket.—The cotton factory, called Buffington Mill, was entirely consumed on the 23d of February. The factory was in full operation in the manufacture of printing cloths, employing 22 looms, and 950 spindles.

Fire at Norwich, Conn.—The block of stores and shops, known as Boswell's Row, was entirely consumed on the 23d of February; likewise an adjoining dwelling house, and a barn in the rear. Mostly covered by insurance.

Fire at New Orleans.—A fire broke out on the 11th of February in the New Orleans Cotton Press. The loss ineurred by the destruction of cotton bales, and the injury to machinery and building is estimated from two to $300,000. All covered by insurance, of which $30,000 are at the North.

Murder in Lunenburgh, Mass.—One day last week, the body of Mrs. Houghton, a widow lady, residing in Lunenburgh, Mass. in a lone and unfrequented part of the country, fourteen miles from any other habitation, was found, horribly mutilated. It appears that Mrs. Houghton was seventy years old, and that the room in which the body was found, contained evidence of a dreadful struggle.

The chairs upset, lamp broken, one of her shoes off, her false curls scattered in two or three places, the bed tumbled and knocked out of place, marks upon her neck, arms, and face, &c. &c. Upon an internal examination by two physicians present, we found six or seven ribs broken—the blood settled and coagulated under them, and also around her throat and upon the lungs. The physicians were satisfied that her person had been violated.

The verdict of coroner's jury was, "strangulation."

A pair of men's woolen gloves were found in the room, which were subsequently identified as belonging to Thomas Barret, an Irishman, who worked for a Mr. Whiting. Barret acknowledged that the gloves were his, but stated that he had sold them to a stranger on the morning of the murder. It was proved, however, that he left Shirly village, drunk, on the evening of the murder, and must have passed Mrs. Houghton's house to gain Mr. Whiting's, where he did not arrive until the next morning. One of his eyes, also, is bunged up, and his face considerably scratched. He has been fully committed for trial.

Awful Calamity.—The house of Dr. Spencer, of Bethany, Conn. lately took fire at midnight. The father and mother escaped in their night-clothes, with their two youngest children; but the father went back to save the elder ones, the roof fell in, and all three perished. The fire is supposed to have originated in hot ashes.

A Seducer Sentenced.—On the 16th instant, a man from Erie county, Pa. was sentenced to the Penitentiary in Alleghany city, having been convicted of seduction under the law against that crime, passed at the last session of the Pennsylvania legislature. This is the first conviction under this new act.

The Fruits of Slavery.—We copy the following from the Florence (Ala.) Gazette:

"A negro man named Martin, belonging to the estate of Captain John Donaldson, deceased, was killed within a few miles of our town, on the 25th ultimo, by Mr. Richard Faires, the overseer of the plantation to which said negro belonged.

"Mr. Faires ordered two of the other negroes to tie Martin, (the deceased,) in order that he (Mr. Faires) might punish him, for some offense committed. Martin refused to submit, and swore that he would kill the first one who should attempt to lay hands upon him. Mr. Faires replied that he (Martin) would then have to kill him. *

Poetry.

THE HAPPY MIND.

BY MISS ELIZA COOK.

Out upon the calf, I say,
Who turns his grumbling head away,
And quarrels with his feed of hay,
Because it is not clover.
Give to me the happy mind,
That will ever seek and find
Something fair and something kind,
All the wide world over.

'Tis passing good to have an eye,
That always manages to spy
Some star to bear it company,
Though planets may be hidden;
And Mrs. Eve was foolish, very,
Not to be well content and merry,
With peach, plum, melon, grape and cherry,
When apples were forbidden.

We love rare flowers, but suppose
We're far from Italy's rich rose,
Must we then turn up our nose
At lilies of the valley?
Can't we snuff at something sweet,
Ir. the "bough pots" that we meet,
Cried and sold in the city street,
By "Sally in our alley?"

Give me the heart that spreads its wings,
Like the free bird that soars and sings,
And sees the bright side of all things,
From Bhering's Straights to Dover.
It is a bank that never breaks,
It is a store thief never takes,
It is a rock that never shakes,
All the wide world over.

We like to give old care the slip,
And listen to the "crank and quip,"
At social board from fluent lip,—
No fellowship is better:
But he must lack the gentle grace,
That marks the best of human race,
Who cannot see a friendly face
In mastiff, hound, or setter.

Wine of the Falerian sort—
Amber, Hock, or tawny Port,
Perhaps a drop of "something short,"
Suits best our dainty drinking.
But should we trudge on pilgrim staff,
With nothing but the rill to quaff,—
Why, he who would not drink and laugh,
Is not too wise, I'm thinking.

Our hungry eyes may fondly wish
To revel amid flesh and fish,
And gloat upon the silver dish,
That holds a golden plover.
Yet, if our table be but spread,
With savory cheese and oaten bread,
Be thankful if we're always fed,
As well the wide world over.

We may prefer Italian notes,
Or choose the melody that floats
About the gay Venetian boats,
Half wild in our extolling;
But surely music may be found,
When some rough native harp unbound,
Strikes up like cherries "round and sound,"
With English "fol-de-rolling."

We may be poor—but then, I guess,
Our trouble with our pomp is less,
For they who wear a russet dress,
May never fear the rumpling.
And though champagne froth never hums
Between our fingers and our thumbs,
Red apoplexy rarely comes,
To dine with plain stone dumpling.

Then out upon the calf, I say,
Who turns his grumbling head away,
And quarrels with his feed of hay,
Because it is not clover.
Give to me the happy mind,
That will ever seek and find
Something good and something kind,
All the wide world over,

TO THE PAST.

BY W. C. BRYANT.

Thou unrelenting Past!
Strong are the barriers round thy dark domain,
And fetters, sure and fast,
Hold all that enter thy unbreathing reign.

Far in thy realm, withdrawn,
Old empires sit in sullenness and gloom,
And glorious ages, gone,
Lie deep within the shadow of thy womb.

Childhood, with all its mirth,
Youth, Manhood, Age, that draws to the ground,
And last, Man's life on earth,
Glide to thy dim dominions, and are bound.

Thou hast my better years—
Thou hast my earlier friends, the good—the kind,
Yielded to thee with tears—
The venerable form—the exalted mind.

My spirit yearns to bring
The lost ones back—yearns with desire intense,
And struggles hard to wring
Thy bolts apart, and pluck thy captives thence.

In vain—thy gates deny
All passage, save to those who hence depart;
Nor to the streaming eye
Thou givest them back—nor to the broken heart.

In thy abysses hide
Beauty and excellence unknown—to thee
Earth's wonder and her pride
Are gathered, as the waters by the sea;

Labors of good to man,
Unpublished charity, unbroken faith—
Love, that 'midst Grief began,
And grew with years, and faltered not in death.

Full many a mighty name
Lurks in thy depths, unuttered, unrevered;
With thee are silent fame,
Forgotten arts, and wisdom disappeared.

Thine for a space are they—
Yet shalt thou yield thy treasures up at last;
Thy gates shall yet give way—
Thy bolts shall fall, inexorable Past!

All that of good and fair
Has gone into thy womb from earliest time,
Shall then come forth, to wear
The glory and the beauty of its prime.

They have not perished—no!
Kind words, remembered voices once so sweet,
Smiles, radiant long ago,
And features, the soul's apparent seat;

All shall come back; each tie
Of pure affection shall be knit again;
Alone shall Evil die,
And Sorrow dwell a prisoner in thy reign.

And then shall I behold
Him, by whose kind paternal side I sprung,
And her, who, still and cold,
Fills the next grave—the beautiful and young.

Miscellany.

From the Boston Courier.

LETTER FROM NEW-YORK.

BY L. MARIA CHILD.

To-day is St. Valentine's day, the observance of which is said to have originated among the Romans who, at a festival of Juno, on the 14th of February, put into a box the names of young women to be drawn out by young men. The Roman Catholics, according to their usual policy of transferring to their church festivals endeared to the populace by long usage, gave the day to St. Valentine instead of Juno. This saint was a Roman bishop, who suffered martyrdom under the Emperor Claudius II. and was afterwards canonized. How he came to be the peculiar patron of love tokens, it is not easy to ascertain. It probably was an accident that the day set apart for him in the Catholic calendar happened to come on the 14th of February. Whatever gave him this distinction, his name is now associated with love and courtship throughout christendom; and very curious are some of the old customs observed in honor of St. Valentine.

Within the few last years, the observance of this festival has been extending in New-York, and it has now become quite a showy affair. Valentines, engraved for the occasion, are displayed in the shop windows in great profusion. The styles are various; from the most beautiful and tasteful devices, valued at seven or eight dollars, down to the most comic and grotesque, for fifty or twenty-five cents. In some, the paper is edged with an exquisite imitation of the finest Brabant lace; and in the corner, a smiling cupid rides on a butterfly, or lies partially concealed in a richly-colored rose. Others are edged with arabesques of gold, on an ultramarine ground; and the letters of the amorous epistle are variously colored, like the gorgeous old illuminated MSS. In some, the image of Cupid sleeps on delicate white satin; in others, he is hidden under a network of silvered or gilded paper, cut so fine, that when raised up, the little god seems enclosed in a cage of cobwebs.

To-day, there is a strong reinforcement of carriers at the despatch post-office, and a great crowd keeps round the doors. Thousands of valentines will be delivered before night, but thousands more will probably be obliged to lie over till to-morrow. "Hail to thy returning festival, old Bishop Valentine!" says Charles Lamb. "Great is thy name in the rubric, thou venerable arch-flamen of Hymen! Immortal go-between! who and what manner of person art thou? Art thou but a name, typifying the restless principle which impels poor humans to seek perfection in union? Or wert thou indeed a mortal prelate, with thy tippit and thy rochet, thy apron on, and decent lawn sleeves? Mysterious personage! Like unto thee assuredly there is no other mitred father in the calender. Thou comest attended with thousands and tens of thousands of little Loves, and the air is "Brushed with the hiss of rustling wings;" singing Cupids are thy choristers; and instead of the crosier, the mystical arrow is borne before thee."

In London, it is said that two hundred thousand letters beyond the usual daily average, annually pass through the post-office on St. Valentine's day.—"Two hundred thousand pence for foolery!" exclaims an old gentleman. To which the daughter replies, "Why then just two hundred thousand peodle must be in love with each other." "Ah child, thou art a foolish reckoner. All valentines are not in love. Instead of bleeding hearts transfixed with arrows, many of them would do well to choose for their emblem a fox eating a silly goose, or a puppy munching the butterfly that sails into his open mouth."

The cynical old gentleman is right; painful as it is to oppose his bitter sarcasm to the rose-colored dreams of unsuspecting youth. Those gaily dressed valentines in our windows, will many of them, be sent on evil errands. To-day will commence some private tragedies, on which the curtain is to fall at the mad-house, or on Blackwell's Island.

Alas, society is like an inverted pyramid, and that which should point to the heavens is buried in the mud. The highest fact in man's mysterious existence, the holiest emblem of the union of the divine with human, the mediation between matter and spirit, by which the former *should* become glorified and godlike, and thus ascend unto the bosom of the FATHER—this sacred gift is trampled under the feet of men, and changed into a stinging serpent, which carries its foul slime over the roses of life.

Moore beautifully describes the contest between two principles which, in the right order of things, would never be antagonistical, but only beautiful and harmonious dualities of one law of our being. He thus describes a festival in the Epicurean gardens; "Over the lake of the Temple were scattered wreaths of flowers, through which boats, filled with beautiful children, floated, as through a liquid parterre. Between two of these boats a mock combat was perpetually carried on; their respective commanders, two blooming youths, being habited to represent Eros and Anteros: the former the CELESTIAL LOVE of the Platonists, and the latter, that more earthly spirit, which usurps the name of LOVE among the Epicureans. Throughout the whole evening, their contest was maintained with various success. The timid distance at which Eros kept aloof from his lively antagonist, being the only safeguard against those darts of fire, with showers of which the other assailed him, but which falling short of their mark upon the lake, only scorched the few flowers on which they fell, and were extinguished."

I have wandered from the shop windows of New-York, to Grecian gardens, in the ancient time. My mind has a troublesome habit, which compels it to fly high above the surface of things, or dive into the hidden caves beneath. To atone for my mystical vagaries, I will tell a true story, not without significance at this season of valentines.

In a city, which shall be nameless, there lived, long ago, a young girl, the only daughter of a widow. She came from the country, and was as ignorant of the dangers of a city, as the squirrels of her native fields. She had glossy black hair, gentle, beaming eyes, and "lips like wet coral." Of course she knew that she was beautiful; for when she was a child, strangers often stopped as she passed, and exclaimed, "How handsome she is!" And as she grew older, the young men gazed on her with admiration. She was poor, and removed to the city to earn her living by covering umbrellas. She was just at that susceptible age, when youth is passing into womanhood; when the soul begins to be pervaded by "that restless principle, which impels poor humans to seek perfection in union."

At the hotel opposite, Lord Henry Stuart, an English nobleman had at that time taken lodgings. His visit to this country is doubtless well remembered by many, for it made a great sensation at the time. He was a peer of the realm, descended from the royal line, and was, morever, a strikingly handsome man, of right princely carriage. He was subsequently a member of the British parliament, and is now dead.

As this distinguished stranger passed to and from his hotel, he encountered the umbrella-girl, and was impressed by her uncommon beauty. He easily traced her to the opposite store, where he soon after went to purchase an umbrella. This was followed up by presents of flowers, chats by the way-side, and invitations to walk or ride; all of which were gratefully accepted by the unsuspecting rustic. He was playing a game, for temporary excitement; she, with a head full of romance, and a heart melting under the influence of love, was unconsciously endangering the happiness of her whole life.

Lord Henry invited her to visit the public gardens, on the Fourth of July. In the simplicity of her heart, she believed all his flattering professions, and considered herself his bride elect; she therefore accepted the invitation, with innocent frankness. But she had no dress to appear on such a public occasion, with a gentleman of high rank, whom she verily supposed to be her destined husband. While these thoughts revolved in her mind, her eye was unfortunately attracted by a beautiful piece of silk, belonging to her employer. Ah, could she not take it without being seen, and pay for it secretly, when she had earned money enough? The temptation conquered her in a moment of weakness. She concealed the silk, and conveyed it to her lodgings. It was the first thing she had ever stolen, and her remorse was painful. She would have carried it back, but she dreaded discovery. She was not sure that her repentance would be met in a spirit of forgiveness.

On the eventful Fourth of July, she came out in her new dress. Lord Henry complimented her upon her elegant appearance; but she was not happy. On their way to the gardens, he talked to her in a manner which she did not comprehend. Perceiving this, he spoke more explicitly. The guileless young creature stopped, looked in his face with mournful reproach, and burst into tears. The nobleman took her hand kindly, and said, "My dear, are you an innocent girl?" "I am, I am," replied she, with convulsive sobs. "Oh, what have I ever done or said, that you should ask me that?" Her words stirred the deep fountains of his better nature. "If you are innocent," said he, "God forbid that I should make you otherwise. But you accepted my invitations and presents so readily, that I supposed you understood me. "What *could* I understand," said she, "except that you intended to make me your wife?" Though reared amid the proudest distinctions of rank, he felt no inclination to smile. He blushed, and was silent. The heartless conventionalities of life stood rebuked in the presence of affectionate simplicity. He conveyed her to her humble home, and bade her farewell, with a thankful consciousness that he had done no irretrievable injury to her future prospects. The remembrance of her would soon be to him as the recollection of last year's butterflies. With her, the wound was deeper. In her solitary chamber she wept, in bitterness of heart, over her ruined air-castles. And that dress, which she had stolen to make an appearance befitting his bride! Oh, what if she should be discovered? And would not the heart of her poor widowed mother break, if she should ever know that her child was a thief? Alas, her wretched forebodings were too true. The silk was traced to her; she was arrested, on her way to the store, and dragged to prison. There she refused all nourishment, and wept incessantly.

On the fourth day, the keeper called upon Isaac T. Hopper, and informed him that there was a young girl in prison, who appeared to be utterly friendless, and determined to die by starvation. The kind-hearted old gentleman immediately went to her assistance. He found her lying on the floor of her cell, with her face buried in her hands, sobbing as if her heart would break. He tried to comfort her, but could obtain no answer.

"Leave us alone," said he to the keeper. "Perhaps she will speak to me, if there is none to hear." When they were alone together, he put back the hair from her temple, laid his hand kindly on her beautiful head, and said, in soothing tones, "My child, consider me as thy father. Tell me all thou hast done. If thou hast taken this silk, let me know all about it. I will do for thee as I would for a daughter; and I doubt not that I can help thee out of this difficulty."

After a long time spent in affectionate entreaty, she leaned her young head on his friendly shoulder, and sobbed out, "Oh, I wish I was dead. What will my poor mother say, when she knows of my disgrace?"

"Perhaps we can manage that she never shall know it," replied he; and alluring her by this hope, he gradually obtained from her the whole story of her acquaintance with the nobleman. He bade her be comforted, and take nourishment; for he would see that the silk was paid for, and the prosecution withdrawn. He went immediately to her employer, and told him the story. "This is her first offense," said he; "the girl is young, and the only child of a poor widow. Give her a chance to retrieve this one false step, and she may be restored to society, a useful and honored woman. I will see that thou art paid for the silk." The man readily agreed to withdraw the prosecution, and said he would have dealt otherwise by the girl, had he known all the circumstances. "Thou shouldst have inquired into the merits of the case, my friend," replied Isaac. "By this kind of thoughtlessness, many a young creature is driven into the downward path, who might easily have been saved."

The good old man then went to the hotel, and inquired for Henry Stuart. The servant said his lordship had not yet risen. "Tell him my business is of importance," said Friend Hopper. The servant soon returned, and conducted him to the chamber. The nobleman appeared surprised that a plain old Quaker should thus intrude upon his luxurious privacy; but when he heard his errand, he blushed deeply, and frankly admitted the truth of the girl's statement. His benevolent visiter took the opportunity to "bear a testimony," as the Friends say, against the sin and selfishness of profligacy. He did it in such a kind and fatherly manner, that the young man's heart was touched. He excused himself, by saying that he would not have tampered with the girl, if he had known her to be virtuous. "I have done many wrong things," said he, "but, thank God, no betrayal of confiding innocence rests on my conscience. I have always esteemed it the basest act of which man is capable." The imprisonment of the poor girl, and the forlorn situation in which she had been found, distressed him greatly. And when Isaac represented that the silk had been stolen for *his* sake, that the girl had thereby lost profitable employment, and was obliged to return to her distant home, to avoid the danger of exposure, he took out a fifty dollar note, and offered it to pay her expenses. "Nay," said Isaac, "thou art a very rich man; I see in thy hand a large roll of such notes. She is the daughter of a poor widow, and thou hast been the means of doing her great injury. Give me another."

Lord Henry handed him another fifty dollar note, and smiled, as he said, "You understand your business well. But you have acted nobly, and I reverence you for it. If you ever visit England, come to see me. I will give you a cordial welcome, and treat you like a nobleman."

"Farewell, friend," replied Isaac. "Though much to blame in this affair, thou too hast behaved nobly. Mayst thou be blessed in domestic life, and trifle no more with the feelings of poor girls; not even with those whom others have betrayed and deserted."

Luckily, the girl had sufficient presence of mind to assume a false name when arrested; by which means, her true name was kept out of the newspapers. "I did this," said she, "for my poor mother's sake." With the money given by Lord Henry, the silk was paid for, and she was sent home to her mother, well provided with clothing. Her name and place of residence remain to this day a secret in the breast of her benefactor.

Several years after the incidents I have related, a lady called at Friend Hopper's house, and asked to see him. When he entered the room, he found a handsomely-dressed young matron, with a blooming boy of five or six years old. She rose to meet him, and her voice choked, as she said, "Friend Hopper, do you know me?" He replied that he did not. She fixed her tearful eyes earnestly upon him, and said, "You once helped me, when in great distress." But the good missionary of humanity had helped too many in distress, to be able to recollect her, without more precise information. With a tremulous voice, she bade her son go into the next room, for a few minutes; then dropping on her knees, she hid her face in his lap, and sobbed out, "I am the girl that stole the silk. Oh, where should I now be, if it had not been for you!"

When her emotion was somewhat calmed, she told him that she had married a highly respectable man, a senator of his native State. Having a call to visit the city, she again and again passed Friend Hopper's house, looking wistfully at the windows to catch a sight of him; but when she attempted to enter, her courage failed.

"But I go away to-morrow," said she, "and I could not leave the city, without once more seeing and thanking him who saved me from ruin." She recalled her little boy, and said to him, "Look at that old gentleman, and remember him well; for he was the best friend your mother ever had." With an earnest invitation that he would visit her happy home, and a fervent "God bless you," she bade her benefactor farewell.

My venerable friend is not aware that I have written this story. I have not published it from any wish to glorify him, but to exert a genial influence on the hearts of others; to do my mite toward teaching society how to cast out the Demon Penalty, by the voice of the Angel Love.

From D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation.

MARTIN LUTHER.

A year had scarcely elapsed, when John and Margaret, hearing what difficulty their son found in supporting himself at Magdeburg, sent him to Eisenach, where there was a celebrated school, and at which place they had relations. They had other children, and though their circumstances were much improved, they could not maintain their son in a city where he was a stranger. The unremitting labors of John Luther could do no more than support the family at Mansfield. He hoped that when Martin got to Eisenach, he would find it easier to earn his living. But he was not more fortunate there than he had been at Magdeburg. His relations who lived in the town did not trouble themselves about him, or perhaps they were very poor, and could not give him any assistance.

When the young scholar was pressed with hunger, he was obliged, as at Magdeburg, to go with his school-fellows and sing in the streets, to earn a morsel of bread. This custom of Luther's time is still preserved in many towns in Germany. These young people's voices sometimes form a most harmonious concert. Often the poor modest boy, instead of bread, received nothing but harsh words. More than once, overwhelmed with sorrow, he shed many tears in secret; he could not look to the future without trembling.

One day, in particular, after having been repulsed from three houses, he was about to return, fasting, to his lodgings, when having reached the Place St. George, he stood before the house of an honest burgher, motionless, and lost in painful reflections. Must he, for want of bread, give up his studies, and go to work with his father, in the mines of Mansfield? Suddenly a door opens, a woman appears on the threshhold—it is the wife of Conrad Cotta, a daughter of the burgomaster of Eilfeld. Her name was Ursula. The chronicles of Eisenach call her "the pious Shunamite," in remembrance of her who so earnestly entreated the prophet Elijah to eat bread with her. The Christian Shunamite had more than once remarked young Martin in the assemblies of the faithful; she had been affected by the sweetness of his voice, and his apparent devotion. She had heard the harsh words with which the poor scholar had been repulsed. She saw him overwhelmed with sorrow before her door; she came to his assistance, beckoned him to enter, and supplied his urgent wants.

Conrad approved his wife's benevolence; he even found so much pleasure in the society of young Luther, that a few days afterwards, he took him to live in his house. From that moment, he no longer feared to be obliged to relinquish his studies. He was not to return to Mansfield, and bury the talent that God had committed to his trust! God had opened the heart and the doors of a Christian family, at the very moment when he did not know what would become of him. This event disposed his soul to that confidence in God, which, at a later period, the severest trials could not shake.

* * * * *

Happy times for the young man! Luther always looked back to them with emotion! and a son of Conrad having gone many years after to study at Wittemberg, when the poor scholar of Eisenach had become the learned teacher of his age, he joyfully received him at his table and under his roof. He wished to repay in part to the son, what he had received from the father and mother.

It was when memory reverted to the Christian woman who had supplied him with bread when every one else repulsed him, that he uttered this memorable saying: "There is nothing sweeter than the heart of a pious woman."

But never did Luther feel ashamed of the time, when pressed by hunger, he sorrowfully begged the bread necessary for the support of life, and the continuance of his studies. So far from this, he thought with gratitude on the extreme poverty of his youth. He considered it as one of the means that God had made use of to make him what he afterwards became, and he thanked Him for it. The condition of poor children who were obliged to lead the same kind of life, touched him to the heart. "Do not despise," said he "the boys who try to earn their bread by chanting before your door, 'bread for the love of God, Panem propter Deum. I have done the same. It is true that in later years my father maintained me at the University of Eifurth, with much love and kindness, supporting me by the sweat of his brow; but one time I was only a poor mendicant. And now, by means of my pen, I have succeeded so well that I would not change fortunes with the grand seignor himself. I may say more; if I were to be offered all the possessions of the earth, heaped one upon another, I would not take them in exchange for what I possess. And yet I should never have known what I do, if I had not been to school, and been taught to write." Thus did this great man acknowledge that these humble beginnings were the origin of his glory. He was not afraid of reminding his readers that that voice whose accents electrified the empire and the world, had not very long before begged a morsel of bread in the streets of a petty town.

* * * * *

The young student spent in the library of the university the moments he could snatch from his academical labors. Books being then scarce, it was in his eyes a great privilege to be able to profit by the treasures of this vast collection. One day, (he had been then two years at Eifurth, and was twenty years of age,) he was opening the books in the library, one after another, in order to read the names of the authors. One which he opened in its turn, drew his attention. He had not seen anything like it, till that hour. He reads the title: it is a Bible! a rare book, unknown at that time. His interest is strongly excited; he is filled with astonishment at finding more in this volume than those fragments of the gospels and epistles which the Church has selected to be read to the people in their places of worship every Sunday in the year. Till then, he had thought that they were the whole word of God. And here are so many pages, so many chapters, so many books, of which he had no idea! His heart beats as he holds in his hand all the Scripture divinely inspired. With eagerness, and indescribable feelings, he turns over these leaves of God's word.

THE BEST IS LEFT.

"I am fallen," cried Jeremy Taylor, "into the hands of publicans and sequestrators, and they have taken all from me. What now? Let me look about me! They have left me sun and moon, fire and water, a loving wife, and many friends to pity me, and some to relieve me; and I can still discourse; and, unless I list, they have not taken away my merry countenance, and my cheerful spirits, and a good conscience; they have still left me the providence of God, and all the promises of the gospel, and my religion, and my hopes of heaven, and my charity to them too. And still I sleep, and digest, and eat, and drink; I read and meditate; I can walk in my neighbor's pleasant fields and see the varieties of natural beauties, and delight in all that in which God delights, that is, in virtue and wisdom, in the whole creation, and in God himself."

GO, AND SIN NO MORE.

The first words printed in the language of the Sandwich Islanders, were, "Go, sin no more;" and the second sentence was, "Cease to do evil, and learn to do well." There are now several converted heathens in good standing in the Church, who ascribe their first impressions of Christian truth to these simple words. In farther illustration of the sublime power of the plain language of the Bible, I will relate the following story:

In one of the New England States, many years ago, a young man was arraigned to take his trial before a jury of his country, on an indictment for theft. The testimony bore very strong against him; but his counsel labored with great skill to dispose of it so as to produce doubt of his guilt on the minds of the jury. He was better able to do this, in consequence of the sympathy which the good looks of the prisoner excited in his behalf. Not to occupy time with unnecessary details, I will proceed to that part of the case which illustrates my idea. The counsel closed the argument for the prisoner with this passage:

"I must ask you, then, gentlemen of the jury, to render a verdict in this case in the spirit of kindness, and at the same time, of admonition. Say to the prisoner, we are grieved to find that the testimony bears so strongly against you; but you *may* be innocent. Your guilt or innocence is known to yourself and your Maker. We, fallible men, have some doubts. We will not, therefore, confine you in prison, and shut you out from society. We will not put you in a cage, and treat you like a wild beast. You look like a *man*; yes, you look like a *man*. Go forth, then, and enjoy the free air of heaven. Mount up on the hills; look down thence upon the streams and hills below; wander among the forests and fields; look upon the smiles of children, and listen to the song of birds. Go forth; go free—go—go, and sin no more."

In saying these last words, tears came into his eyes, his voice faltered, and he sat down. At the same time, the prisoner arose from his seat, and as if acting under the influence of a command he could not resist, deliberately descended from the prisoner's box, and was making his way out of the court-room, when the sheriff grasped him by the collar. His counsel arose again, and said he hoped, if the prosecuting attorney and the jury had no objection, the court would order the sheriff to let him go.

The prosecuting attorney, though unused to the melting mood, turned to the court with strange damp spots on each cheek, and with an unusual quivering and softness of voice, said he had no farther remarks to offer to the jury.

The court turned to the jury, saying, "Gentlemen, we have no charge to give."

Foreman—We have a verdict to render, of *not guilty*.

Clerk—So say you all, gentlemen?

The jury bowed, and the prisoner, like an uncaged bird, went on his way rejoicing.

Now the prisoner goes to pay his lawyer's fee, and is told by him, not a dollar will he accept that has not been honestly acquired. "If," said he, "you have stolen this money, let none of your future earnings be considered your own, until you have paid up the uttermost farthing."

Useful man! I honor you! The very next day the young man was seen doing service in the employment of the man who had lost the money.

Many years have elapsed since these incidents occurred, and the rescued person cannot now see or think of the words, "Go, sin no more," without weeping. He is at this time a good citizen of Cincinnati, a prosperous, an honest, and a pious man.

CHANTING THE "MISERERE" AT ROME.

Thirteen candles, in the form of a triangle, are lighted up when the chanting of the lamentations commences. One after another is extinguished as it proceeds, until the last one, at the top of the triangle, which represents *Christ*, is put out. The others, representing the prophets and good men that proceeded our Saviour, one by one go out in the night of the grave, and the lamentation grows wilder and deeper. But as the Prophet of Prophets, the Light, the Hope of the World, disappeared the lament suddenly ceased. Not a sound was heard amid the deepening gloom. The catastrophe was too awful and the shock too great to admit of speech. He who had been pouring his sorrowful notes over the departure of the good and great, seemed struck dumb at this greatest wo. Stunned and stupified, he could not contemplate the mighty disaster. I never felt a heavier pressure on my heart than at this moment. The chapel was packed in every inch of it, even out of the doors, far back into the open half, and yet not a sound was heard. I could hear the breathing of the mighty multitude, and amid it the frequent half-drawn sigh. Like the chanter, each man seemed to say, "Christ is gone! We are orphans—all orphans!"

The silence at length became too painful. I thought I should shriek out in agony, when suddenly a low wail, so desolate, and yet so sweet, so despairing, and yet so tender, like the last strain of a broken heart, slowly stole out from the distant enclosure, and swelled over the throng, that the tears rushed unbidden to my eyes, and I could have wept like a child in sympathy. It then died away, as if the grief were too great for the strain. Fainter and fainter, like the tone of a lute, it sunk away, as if its last strain was over, when suddenly there burst through the arches a cry so piercing and shrill that it seemed not the voice of song, but the language of a wounded and dying heart in its last agonizing throb. The multitude swayed to it like the forest to the blast. Again it ceased, and the broken sobs of exhausted grief, alone were heard. In a moment the whole choir joined their lament, and seemed to weep with the weeper. After a few notes they paused again, and that sweet, melancholy voice mourned alone. Its note is still in my ear. I wanted to see the singer. It seemed that such sounds could come from nothing but a broken heart. Oh, how unlike the joyful, the triumphant anthem that swept through the same chapel, on the morning that symbolized his resurrection!—*Correspondence of the Tribune.*

BUTTONS.

Some idea can be formed of the amount of buttons made at J. & J. Hayden's establishment for Hon. S. Willston, of Easthampton, from the fact, that a teamster of this town, a few days since, took *three tons of buttons* to Hartford for him to supply orders; and that he now has orders for *twenty tons more!*

Since writing the above, says the Northampton Courier, we have received the following from a correspondent:—

Who would not play button?—From small beginnings it is well known, that there have been great results which have become history. But to come down to incidents of recent occurrence, we will simply relate what our ears have heard about a *button*. The business commenced here, almost from accident.—The proprietor has been so successful within a few years, as to lay a foundation for a princely annual income, nearly or quite equal to the salary of the *President of the United States*. This gentleman having a coat making, as the story goes, the fashion required covered buttons; but none being found of such quality or finish as to suit his lady, she undertook to cover some herself to suit her fancy, and ornament the garment of her husband. From this simple circumstance, we are told, originated the Button Business, which has become of such importance as to astonish the nations. We understand that the proprietor is liberal in the endowment for schools of science, the various charitable institutions of the day, and when good deeds will be perpetuated by the publications of the day, he will adorn a niche in the Temple of Fame. Long may he live to enjoy the fruits of his industry in doing and communicating.

Sarah Williamson has sued Josiah Hope, in Michigan, for breach of promise. Poor thing! "Hope told a flattering tale."

FOR HOUSEKEEPERS AND FARMERS.

Remedy for cold feet.—Dip or plunge the feet into a basin or bucket of cold water; immediately take them out, and rub till they are thoroughly dry; or if snow is handy, rub them with snow. Do this two or three times a week, and in a short time it will be so agreeable that you will use the snow or water almost daily, and never have a cold foot, let the weather be ever so cold. This is a law of nature. Wear the boots so large that the toes can easily move and expand themselves, and you may go without stockings. The feet will get used to it, like the face and hands, and stand the weather without a covering: yea, let me ask, why not the feet get used to the weather as well as the face, without a covering except the boots—which is, and always will be, covering enough.

Experiments in Raising Potatoes.—Mr. Elisha Williams, of Argyle, Penobscot county, Me. took a small quantity of potatoes last spring, and divided each potato into four equal parts, planting the butt end, the seed end, and the two centre pieces, each separate, and the produce was, from the butt ends, forty pounds; from the seed ends sixty-two pounds; and from the centre pieces both together, one hundred and sixty pounds—showing the superiority of the centre pieces by fifty-eight pounds in the quantity planted.—*New England Farmer.*

Important Discovery.—A discovery has been made of a way of bardening wood, so as to give it almost the compactness of iron. This, it is said, is done by exhausting the air from the wood by an air pump, and then saturating it with iron and lime, in solution. Wood submitted to this process, has been used for some time on railroads in England, and found so firm as to have been scarcely marked by the wheels of the cars.

Cooking Hams.—Hams should, previously to boiling, be soaked to make them tender. A green or new ham, may be put in soak early in the evening, and the water changed about ten or eleven o'clock. One night's soaking will be enough for it. An older ham should soak twenty-four hours; and one two years old will require soaking for two days and nights; always changing the water at intervals. A ham weighing fifteen or twenty pounds, should be boiled six or seven hours, simmering slowly the first hour. Take care to skim the pot well.

When the ham is done, strip off the skin, which should be saved to skewer on again when the ham is put away cold. This will prevent the cold ham from becoming dry and hard.

A cold ham that has not been cut, can be greatly improved by glazing it as follows: Have ready a sufficiency of beaten yolk of egg,—and dipping in a brush or a pen-feather, go all over the ham with it. Then cover it with bread-crumbs grated as finely as possible—and afterwards go over it with cream. Finish by browning it in the oven of a stove. This glazing is delicious.

Cold boiled ham is better than raw for broiling or frying. If raw ham is to be broiled or fryed, scald it several times, to take out the salt which otherwise will ooze forth in cooking, and stand upon the surface of the slices, tasting and looking unpleasantly. When scalded, it should lie in hot water half an hour.

There is, however, no process of curing that will make good hams, unless the pork is of the best quality, and corn-fed.—*Miss Leslie.*

Apple Bread.—A French officer has invented, and practised with great success, a method of making bread with common apples, very far superior to potato bread. After having boiled one-third of peeled apples, he bruised them while quite warm into two-thirds of flour, including the proper quantity of yeast, kneaded the whole without water, the juice of the fruit being quite sufficient. When the mixture had acquired the consistency of paste, he put it into a vessel, in which he allowed it to rise for about twelve hours. By this process he obtained very excellent bread, full of eyes, and extremely palatable and light.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS, FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages. Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress*. The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

Upright men shall be astonished at this, and the innocent shall stir up himself against the hypocrite.—*Job. xvii. 8.*

Abhor detraction, the sin of fallen angels, and the worst of fallen men.—*Wm. Penn.*

NARRATIVE of the Proceedings of the Monthly Meeting of New-York, and their Subsequent Confirmation by the Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, in the case of Isaac T. Hopper. Just published, and for sale at this office, No. 143 Nassau street, New-York; and at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 31 North Fifth street, Philadelphia.

KENNETT SQUARE BOARDING SCHOOL.

For Young Men and Boys.

THIS institution occupies one of the most pleasant and healthy situations in Chester county, Pa. on the mail route between Baltimore and Philadelphia, and about 12 miles northwest of Wilmington, Delaware. With each of the above-mentioned places, there is an easy communication by means of stages.

The course of mathematical instruction will include algebra, geometry, plane and spherical trigonometry, surveying, mensuration, astronomy, &c.

The ordinary branches of an English education, reading, writing, arithmetic, English grammar, geography, history, composition, &c.—will be thoroughly taught. Instruction will also be given in book-keeping, and in the Latin and French languages. The study of Botany will be made thorough and practical—the pupils with their teacher, will make frequent excursions, for the examination of plants, during the season of flowers.

Parents may rest assured that the most careful attention will be paid to the health and morals of the pupils. The neighborhood has acquired no small degree of distinction for its highly intellectual and moral standing.

Scholars, coming from a distance will be expected to board at the institution, where they will be under the constant care of the teacher.

TERMS:—For tuition, boarding, washing, &c. $30 per term of *eleven weeks*, one half payable in advance. An extra charge of $4, will be made for instruction in either of the languages. Boys, under twelve years, studying the common branches only, may be admitted for $25 per term. Pupils will furnish their own wash-basins and towels. Books and stationery furnished at the usual prices.

The term will commence the first second day in the eleventh month (November). There will be two vacations; one in the spring, the other in the fall.

JONATHAN LAMBORN, *Principal.*
JEREMIAH HAYHURST, *Teacher.*
Chester co. Pa. August 31, 1843. 6m.

FREE CALICOES!

JUST received, 1 case fine calicoes. Also, 2 cases fine shirting muslins; together with a large assortment of other free dry goods, at reduced prices, wholesale and retail.

CHARLES WISE,
Northwest corner Arch and Fifth streets.
Philadelphia, 8th, mo. 17th 1843. tf.

TEXAS AND MEXICO.